

Reclaiming our wild origins

A radical critique of civilization

by

Lars Larsen



Cover Photo by photographer Titti Spaltro. The image features Lars Larsen standing in front of his little hut/hole in the Nackareservatet National Park with a pile of books that he will move from the old hole to the new.

No rights reserved. It behoves everyone to spread my book however they want, I don't accept copyright. My book belongs to the so called "Public Domain".

This book is a bad translation of the Swedish book "Åter till det vilda", translated by the author (not very fluent in English), and written the same year as the Swedish version, namely 2017.

Innehåll

Preface	2
Introduction: We need an environmental revival!	3
We are in the midst of an invisible war.....	3
Learning from the time when man didn't distinguish between work and leisure time	4
The dream about the lost golden age	4
About the absurd features of hell doctrine. And a little about ecopsychology	4
Do we have a gigantic debt to the environment?.....	5
The copernican revolution of environmental ethics.....	5
Humanity might go extinct in a hundred years	5
God and the carelessness of the westerner	6
Sometimes it can be good to be a little lazy.....	6
We need to sacrifice ourselves for nature.....	6
The meaning of my life	7
What the monuments of civilization are	7
The collapse a liberation	7
Walking barefoot – a silent revolt against civilization.....	7
Some words from David Wasdell	7
Civilization: Heaven and hell upside-down.....	8
One's own salvation is not the most important	8
Humanity has become like a cancer on the body of Mother Earth	8
Civilization is collective madness	9
How civilization disturbs the balance in nature	9
We have to dare to err.....	10
The return of nature.....	11
The desperate slaves of civilization	11
Long live the fragile life!.....	11
The boring state.....	11
The silver glance	12
Self-strictness	12
Something about utopia and morality.....	12
Climate and the categorical imperative of Immanuel Kant.....	12
Something about animalism	13
Civilization is a coarsening process	13
The scientists are like missionaries of civilization	14
Animalism in its relation to anarchoprimitivism	14
My idea for how to dismantle civilization	15
An immanent, natural spirituality	17
God is wild	18
The sadhus and the atheists of the west.....	18

The sterile, fascistic heaven fantasies of the civilized ...	18
Poop and pee are the gold of nature	19
What would you do if you had only seven years left to live?	19
Is death something evil?	19
The essence of psychosis.....	20
The churches of Sweden – disgraces for the country ...	21
Lewis Mumford about the Eichmanns of our time	22
Civilization as the inner essence of fascism	22
How the hell of civilization gets reproduced	22
What of civilization I think one should begin to dismantle. And which "industries" one should encourage.....	23
Has animalism come too late?.....	23
Civilized art and culture: a TV in the prisoner's cell	24
The horror of the zoos.....	24
Something about the fascism of our time: the police and the military	24
Everything is adjusted for the catastrophe.....	24
Money should be abolished	25
The hubris of civilization.....	25
The total lack of wildmen/wildwomen in the western world	25
Why I believe that the core of animalism is true. And something about how animalism arose.....	25
The belief in the saving power of technology. And something about the movie Avatar.	26
Our schools have missed the most important in education	27
The rich world has lost the most important; community	27
One doesn't compromise with fascists	28
The inherent mercy of animalism and anarcho-primitivism.....	28
Why I don't like mathematics	29
Civilization resembles an alcoholic	29
When it becomes more important to "be right" than to "live rightly"	30
How it looks like on my horizon. How I believe I will die	31
Slavery has not been abolished.....	31
Something about permaculture.....	32
The lovely anarchy of nature. Work as a hobby.	32
Why I don't believe dogs are fascistic	33
The "Back to the sources"-motif. Back to nature and the animal kingdom	34
To die before death. To practice in dying, practice in unselfishness.....	35
Death is ecological	35
How oil addiction resembles drug addiction	36
To reverse the evolution of humanity.....	36

The forest garden of Holma.....	37
The collapse crawls closer and closer – the poor are affected first and notice it first.....	38
Colonialism has not been abolished	39
The colonization of nature. And something about humanism, science and zoos.	40
The school teacher's bullying of the pupils.....	40
All cruelty to animals should be criminalized.....	41
We in the west are bad role models for the third world.	42
How America forced the children of the indigenous people into boarding schools. How colonialism has continued.	42
What true culture is. The rottenness of humanism	42
Carbon rationing and David Jonstad's book "Our fair share"	43
My ideal ecovillage. And a possible future scenario.	43
How we might help our pets and our livestock to rewild. A possible future scenario in this regard.	46
Appendix.....	46
A. What is Peak Oil?.....	46
B. The climate and the "two degree target"	47
C. The rule of "The Holy Order of Nature"	47

Preface

In the year 2010 my book "Animalistic theology. The return of paradise" was published by the publisher Titel. Since then a lot has happened in my world of thought, not least that I have become an atheist. I don't recognise any more as mine the religious content in that book, which is a theological shaping of the idea of anarchoprimitivism, called "animalism" (I will explain the notion later in the book). The core of animalism, stripped of all religious content, has nevertheless remained the foundation of my thinking, which nowadays is of an ecophilosophic kind, instead of an ecotheologic kind.

I feel now that time has come for me to update animalism in a non-religious book about it. I don't want to let the book "Animalistic theology" become the last word about animalism. My present non-religious animalism stems from my previous religious animalism about in the same way as chemistry stems from alchemy.

"Animalistic theology" was sprinted in only 50 copies and didn't receive any actual newspaper reviews (which I consider as a luck, because I don't think the book is so good any more). With my new book I hope to reach a broader audience with animalism.

"Civilization" is a notion that is crucial for this book. With this I mean those societies which are based on domestication (taming) of animals, plants and humans, on impoverishment and ruthless exploitation of the environment, and where the urban

culture is at the centre. Empires, in other words. The wild indigenous people are thus not included in this definition, not even the indigenous people of North America (even though they to some extent domesticated animals and plants), because their society didn't have any urban culture and no ruthless exploitation of the environment.

In my book I'm thoroughly putting civilization over against the animal and the natural, where civilization represents the decadence and the unnatural and mad, and the animal and the wild represent the natural and the good life. This contradicts how the concepts are used in everyday speech. To be "civilized" in everyday speech is to be decent, courtly, gentle and humane, while to be "animal" and "wild" is to be barbarous, crude, rude, erratic, and inhumane. I would like that we think a little deeper upon these two concepts, and investigate if the animals and the wild really deserves that we use the concepts "animal" and "wild" so, and if civilization deserves that we use the concept "civilized" in the aforementioned way. Are the animals and the wild really so terrible, and is civilization really so good? This book is, among other things, an examination of the thesis that civilization is good and the wild and animal is bad.

I decidedly want to dissociate myself from all ecofascism. I have consistently been on my guard against such tendencies by me when I have edited the book. If you notice anything like that in the book, mail me on msafigl@gmail.com. My great "idea" for dismantling civilization in the middle of the book is not meant as a law which everyone should follow, but as a package of ideas which want to show that it's possible to imagine how one dismantles civilization in practice. Nothing of what I suggest in the book would I like to be realised dictatorially, through coercion. The reason? I believe in the good in man, in grassroot democracy and cooperation.

This book is a first fumbling attempt to an ecological overall outlook, an ecophilosophy. Bear with me, it's probably still very immature. I'm neither an academic ecophilosopher, so you won't find an academic discussion inside it, but mostly an attempt to commonsense.

My book is made of a number of blogposts that I published on my blog "For the sake of nature" ("För naturens skull") 2015-2016, a blog which is still active on the adress www.universalist.blogg.se. I have largely arranged the chapters in the book in the order they appear on the blog, so that the reader can see how my thoughts have developed.

The book is intended for the great public, not just for the "already saved", i.e. the environmental movement. Bear therefore with the book when it doesn't dig deeply into many of its subjects, but is intended more as an introduction to my radical green critique of civilization. Deepening is to be awaited in coming books, which are under process.

Lars Larsen, Stockholm, at autumn 2017

Introduction: We need an environmental revival!

Imagine that the biblical savage and prophet John the Baptist plumps down into our time, and visits our present planet for the first time. He circumnavigates the world, guided by a climate scientist, who explains to him what he sees, and who also teaches him about the state and future of the climate on earth.

On his journey John the Baptist recognizes one thing very carefully. It is the massive traffic in the metropolises of the world, which just spews out carbon dioxide, and the huge factory chimneys which quite visibly do the same. This gets John to wonder if we are insane – with this practice we are stealing existence from our descendants, and we risk that the planet becomes uninhabitable in hundred years or so, or even sooner.

John just makes one single conclusion; the planet needs a global, massive environmental revival to stop this, together with a heroic mobilization of the powers of humanity, similar to what the allied carried out during the Second World War, to stop the carbon dioxide emissions. We need a global powerful recession, yes a planned powerful degrowth in the global economy, coupled with a powerful planned population reduction, through almost stopping to give birth to new children. All this need a gigantic environmental revival to be able to start off.

So John the Baptist begins to print flyers and tracts, with the revival message, and begins to preach the message on streets and market places, when he doesn't find other channels for his message (the establishment doesn't take him seriously). Everywhere he shouts: "We have to start an environmental revival!"

We are in the midst of an invisible war

We are in the midst of an invisible war. A war that often isn't recognized. It is the great war against the animals and nature (about 150-200 species of animals and plants go extinct every day, according to the UN environment programme 2010 *), against the climate, against the third world, and nonetheless, our **descendants**. They are the ones who have to pay for the exploitative, civilized lifestyle that we are having now, they have to pay our sky-high government debt. This war is sneaky. The victims are swept under the table by the sneaky advertisement business and the TV-programs which treat us like fools. To convert and civilize wild indigenous people is considered as a great sacrifice, "the white man's burden". We believe that if we only get the third world into going to school (and it thereby gets absorbed by western values), then the problem of poverty will be solved, while we build our gigantic factories where the wild nature once flourished and nourished indigenous people. We take their coconuts and send them across half of the globe, and pay them money, just so they can buy our unnecessary, oppressive luxury gadgets, made in the third world under slave-like conditions, and with slave-like salaries. We grow tobacco, cacao, tea and coffee, altogether unnecessary products, on the once so precious nature areas of the indigenous peoples, which nourished them with food like a mother. Thus we seize the ground which the third world would need for food production in order to relieve starvation for the 800 million who starve on our planet.

When will this invisible war end? Does civilization have to collapse for it to end? Does humanity have to go extinct, for

nature to be able to recover? Now civilization reminds of yeast in a grapejuice bottle, the yeast eats of the grapesugar, and produce alcohol as waste. But at last the sugar is eaten, and the yeast dies from the waste, the alcohol, that changes the grapejuice into wine. Similarly civilization eats oil, coal and natural gas, and produces carbon dioxide as waste. But civilization doesn't stop eating the oil, coal and natural gas until almost everything is eaten. Will civilization die from the waste, the carbon dioxide, when it produces abrupt climate change?

* So Ahmed Djoghlaif said, the secretary general for "the UN Convention on Biological Diversity" 2010. It sounds like an exaggeration, and the estimates of scientist regarding the extinction rate vary greatly, but it says something about how serious the situation is that such reports emerge from authorities in the area.

Learning from the time when man didn't distinguish between work and leisure time

"Something that also gives an idea about the view on work is that certain tribes, for example the Australian people "Yir-Yoront", don't make any linguistic difference between the words "work" and "play". (David Jonstad about Australian indigenous people in his book "Grounded. Simpler life in the shadow of the collapse", [In Swedish "Jordad. Enklare liv i kollapsens skugga"], Ordfront 2016)

... "another dichotomy appears, the distinction between work and non-work, which for so many, many generations did not exist.", the anarchoprimitivistic philosopher John Zerzan writes in his book "Twilight of the machines" (2008). He means those two million years when we lived uncivilized as hunter-gatherers. Then the division of labour which came later in civilization, didn't exist. And work was like playing! Man "worked" then as the animals "work". Who thinks that a bumblebee "works" when it buzzes from flower to flower? It does what it's created to do. We aren't created for those jobs which civilization gives us today. They are not in our genes. This is why we make a difference between labour and leisure time, and consider work as demanding and cumbersome, so that we need "leisure time". But during two million years work wasn't cumbersome for man, paleo-anthropologists have calculated that we then used around two to four hours a day for hunting and gathering food. When one "works" only two to four hours a day, and in addition with things that are directly bound up with survival, things which are deeply meaningful, then it doesn't feel like work. By contrast it gets one to think about the myth of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden.

I can't avoid a certain longing for that state, in which man has lived during the biggest part of his history, and neither I can avoid a certain wondering if it is possible to return to this state. What is required, would be that we let our croplands grow into forests again, and that we gradually release all livestock into these forests, so they can rewild. Then we could live on fishing (I don't really like hunting, I accept it only in desperate situations) and gathering of nuts, apples, pears, berries and other things that one can dry for the winter. If we returned to this state, I would surrender my semi-vegetarianism, and parttake in fishing. But such a state would demand a radical reduction of

the population, maybe down to one tenth, to 750 millions globally. This is neither impossible to think of, if most of humanity stop having children. The likely future collapse of civilization would also help us to become fewer. I have personally decided to not have children, and I encourage others therto. We are radically overcrowded, according to myself and many others inside the environmental movement, and nature is vanishing because of the stress of overpopulation.

I don't, however, think any longer, as in my last book "Animalistic theology" (2010), that our original life in the jungle was a paradise, but it was neither so bad as modern civilization wants us to believe. I think the truth lies somewhere in between. The paradisaical element lay rather in the fact that we didn't need to work, that we had a strong fellowship, and that we lived in harmony with the rest of creation, without exploiting nature and without enslaving other beings.

The dream about the lost golden age

"In my first book, Memories and Visions of Paradise (Tarcher, 1989; Quest, 1995), I even hypothesized that the universal myth of a lost Golden Age might represent humanity's collective memory of the time before plows, kings, and armies."

(Richard Heinberg)

About the absurd features of the hell doctrine. And something about ecopsychology

The classical Christian hell doctrine has many absurd features, but the most absurd is this: How can anybody be blissful in his house if he/she knows that just now there is a torture chamber in his/her cellar, where bandits torture one of her friends. And he/she knows also that this will continue for eternity.

In the hands of a sadist this bliss would be understandable, the sadist enjoy himself by seeing others in agony. But instantly when empathy enters the scene, the joy is also gone forever in such a situation.

Can one be truly joyful as long as some of one's near and dear are in agony? I don't think so. We suffer with those who suffer. Joy in such a situation would be totally egoistic. Religion and drugs might give a temporary high then, but the joy would not be genuine, and even less continuous.

Can anyone be truly happy as long as our beloved nature is plagued until fever, and billions of animals have a heavy and monotonous life in the animal factories? I don't think so. I think ecopsychology has much to offer here. It recognizes a connection between the prevailing mental problems and our broken environment. We have to go the heavy way to healing for the environment if we shall have a chance to begin to feel good. But this you'll never hear from a psychiatrist. They seldom see the big connections.

Do we have a gigantic debt to the environment?

Is debt only something that can exist between humans? Couldn't we also think that one can become indebted to the animals and the environment, yes even to coming generations? I think so. I even think that our civilization's debt to the animals and to nature and coming generations greatly surpasses the total debt of all nations to each other. But it doesn't work to pay this off in money. We have to pay it off by retreating from our occupation of the planet, standing back from our royal throne, and letting other species than our own get back their habitat. We have in fact stolen the ground from the animals and nature. And the bills for such crimes are sky-high. It can even cost us as much as the extinction of our species, if we don't step back and give space to those we have shooed away. And every day we steal precious oil which future generations would need to build a sustainable world. This theft is so grave that it costs us climate change and energy crisis.

What do we owe the animals, nature and coming generations? And how do we atone for the gruesome crime that so nicely is called "civilization"? I think that everything can be boiled down to the ground we live on. We owe the animals and nature the ground we live on. So radical is our crime. The croplands don't want to be sterile areas of monoculture, as they are today. They want to be wild, they want to nourish countless species, animals and plants in great diversity, and nonetheless, they want to be forests. We owe the nature all our croplands, so that she can grow wild again, become forest again. And what does this mean for us humans? What sacrifice does it require? I think we have to collectively refrain from multiplying. Except for some people who should ensure the survival of humanity. We have to at least go down to 750 million people, one tenth of our present number, I think. And this should be done in a short timeframe. Surely it won't work if we don't die in great amounts. But even this we owe nature. We are environmental criminals who are waiting our punishments, climate catastrophe, yes even death by starving, because of climate change and Peak Oil (see what this means in Appendix A).

The copernican revolution of environmental ethics

In comparison to the ethical challenges that environmental problems imply, the typical moralism of religions appear like playing in the sandbox. The importance of environmental ethics is so gigantic in comparison, that, when one realises it, one has to experience a copernican revolution. The moralism of religions revolve around humans and the gods, while environmental ethics revolve around life itself, the very survival of life, the survival of ecosystems. I will also insist, that when one begins to focus on environmental ethics, the typical sins of religions are so minimal that it's simply laughable. Take for example the fundamentalist prohibition of abort and homosexuality. What are such « sins » in comparison to spewing carbon dioxide from one's car, so that the survival of life itself on the planet is endangered because of climate change?

One gets a completely different moral consciousness than the religions offer, when one gets one's « environmental ethics awakening ». The religions truly haven't much to offer in regard to environmental ethics (except maybe New Age, certain forms of buddhism et al). Environmental ethics require that man stops ruling over her surroundings, and integrate into the animal- and plant kingdom, as a brother among brothers. Religions have

mostly advocated the position of man as sovereign ruler in relation to the rest of the creation, and now we see the results in the reactions of the environment. Those who rule are tempted into power abuse, yes it's almost impossible not to abuse one's power when one is in a power position. We have to refrain from our power if we shall be able to stop our abuse of power.

Humanity might go extinct in a hundred years

« The problem with fossil fuels is that they lead to a climate that in the long run makes the planet uninhabitable »

(Alf Hornborg, professor of human ecology at Lund University, Sweden)

"One day man will surely disappear from the earth, and it can be worthwhile to consider, that this day might be closer than we believe"

(Georg Henrik von Wright (1916-2003), professor of philosophy, in the book "Science and reason » [originally in swedish : « Vetenskapen och förnuftet »], Bonniers 1987)

Lately I have begun seriously worrying about whether humanity will go extinct in a near future, in a hundred years or so. My strongest alarm-clock has been Guy McPherson, a conservation biologist and environmental professor emeritus at the university of Arizona, USA. I have read a lot on his blog « Nature Bats Last ». He suggests that humanity will go extinct before 2030, yes already within ten years, due to runaway climate change. And he suggests, that if civilization would collapse now, humanity would only survive a few years, because climate change would take a giant leap forward in a few days, when soot (and related particles) which are in the atmosphere quickly are removed (the particles functions as an umbrella for the sun, and hide the true climate warming, which is much greater than one would believe if the particles wouldn't reflect away the sun rays, it's called Global Dimming). It would quickly be three degrees warmer on the planet, and this is something which the plants wouldn't manage, but we would lose our habitat, simply our food (the planet was already 1,5 degrees warmer than preindustrial time during the year 2016). *"We are in a fool's paradise, accidentally kept cool by smoke"*, James Lovelock said on Global Dimming.

And moreover all our about 450 nuclear power plants on the planet would experience horrific meltdowns, since it takes a couple of decades or more of planned work to shut down a nuclear power plant. And the overall ionizing radiation from the nuclear power plants would also gradually eradicate humanity.

McPherson says that we are in a situation of « damned if you do, damned if you don't ». If we continue emitting carbon dioxide, the climate warms up, and if we stop emitting, the « umbrella particles » fall down from the atmosphere, and the climate warms up thereby.

That's not all. On the sea floor of the Arctic the methane gas is roaring, frozen « methane clathrates » which are threatened by climate warming to melt and rise from the bottom to be absorbed by the atmosphere. Field researchers as Natalia Shakova and Igor Semiletov have said that the sea floor at any

time can release a « burp » of 50 gigaton methane, which is a much more powerful greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide (100 times stronger in a short time perspective). If this would happen, then it will soon be the end of humanity (there is only 5 gigaton methane in the whole atmosphere). Already now there is gigantic areas up to 150 km in diameter, which releases methane to the atmosphere in the form of bubbles which rise up from the water. This is one example of the many « selfreinforcing feedback loops » which threatens our planet.

Big amounts of methane is not only coming from the sea floor in the Arctic. The global warming is also thawing out the permafrost in Siberia and Alaska, with huge methane emissions as a result.

Now it might surely be that McPherson is too radical in his time frame, but this is not the most important thing. The essential here is that a scientist, an environment professor, can come with such predictions at all. It says something about the time we are living in, and about how serious and abrupt the climate change is. I believe that humanity will go extinct, but maybe much later than McPherson thinks. The environment professor and conservation biologist Paul Ehrlich, who has written so much about the overpopulation problem, believes for example that humanity will go extinct in half a century, about 2065. And the microbiologist Frank Fenner and the physicist Stephen Hawking believes that we have hundred years left as a specie, then we disappear. Hawking suggests that our only salvation is to leave earth, colonizing space.

It seems too late to do something about climate change. Whatever we do, whether we stop emitting carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, or do business-as-usual, it looks grim. The train has gone. Now there is only left driving over the cliff. For me McPhersons blog is like a death sentence for humanity, which is condemned for the crime of building civilization, for having left the nomadic hunter-gatherer lifestyle, and begun with agriculture and with building cities. Building cities was the original crime which all other crimes are somehow grounded in. We should have settled with the small-scale life, the humble life inside the boundaries of the ecosystem, in harmony with our whole history as an animal specie. Along with urbanisation humanity began to behave cancerously. We revolted against our history, our animal history, and placed ourselves above the rest of the animals through domesticating livestock. Everything since then existed just for us, to be exploited by us. We were the centre, not only on the planet, but in the whole infinite cosmos. A greater hubris than this (which especially religions cultivate) is difficult to grasp. But on this hubris « *nemesis* » follows, as the philosopher Georg Henrik von Wright writes so well about in the book « The myth of progress » (Originally in swedish : « Myten om framsteget », Bonniers 1993).

How shall one tackle such a death sentence? Shall one only give up all efforts for betterment and amnesty? I don't think so. I think we have to go on fighting even if all hope is gone. It's a question of respect for the dying life, for the swan song of the ecosystem and humanity. We must until the very last refuse to pollute the nature and logg our forests, even if climate change will do its fair share to damage the ecosystem. And there is hope that we can save many nonhuman species from extinction, yes the planet itself from dying. That's worth fighting for.

It's also about our self-respect. And furthermore, one doesn't torture one who is dying. One gives her painkillers instead, and sings for her some beautiful folk song, which she remembers from her childhood. And talks with her, nonetheless. We have to talk with the dying nature, and with each others, about what is about to happen. We have to learn the animal language again, which we once were able to speak, when we still were one with our animal nature. The language beyond words. The pure communication, the encounter face-to-face. I want to make my life a part of the swan song of nature after her encounter with her executioner, man. I don't think my "animalism" was so stupid as I have believed. That we have to reconnect with our animal origins. That's what my swan song will be about.

*« The devout life that midday light forgot
slowly awakens with our farewell pain,
- And what the young humanity had dreamed
burns against us as a holy heart.*

(Bertil Malmberg, a swedish poet, from the poem «Evening glow» [Swedish name: "Aftonrodnad") in the collection of poems "Poems at the border", "Dikter vid gränsen", 1935)

There is a group on Facebook which is committed to support people who has understood that humanity soon will go extinct, a so called "Near Term Human Extinction support group". It has over 4000 members. I'm not alone in this.

God and the carelessness of the westerner

The god of the fundamentalists, who doesn't listen to the cries of the damned in hell, who refuses to save them from the eternal damnation when they are in hell – doesn't he mirror the westerner's carelessness towards the misery of the poor in the third world, likewise towards the misery of the animals and nature? Is there perhaps some connection here?

Sometimes it can be good to be a little lazy

Sometimes it can be good to be a little lazy. Imagine that the big bussinesses of the world would be lazy. Then they wouldn't damage so much nature and not exploit the third world so much.

We need to sacrifice ourselves for nature

"I promote resistance against this omnicidal culture, not in the hope that it will save our species, but in the hope that it will save other species. Because as E.O. Wilson, biologist at Harvard, points out, it only takes 10 million years after a great extinction event, before you have a blossoming full rich planet again. That's what we're working toward. We're saving habitat for other species at this point."

(Guy McPherson)

I have thought a bit about the moral plausibility of my shouting-actions in different churches during the winter 2007/2008. Those actions where I shouted things like « To hell with your western living standard, it oppresses the third world ! », and « Woe unto you that are rich ! » (there is a little youtubevideo from one of the actions on Youtube, search on « Lars Larsen munken ») . At one point I believed that I had done something wrong, and even asked several churches for forgiveness, but when I now think about it, then the actions truly were something of the best I have ever done. Maybe it made some rich christian to give more alms to the third world, maybe it made some rich pentecostalist to drop his living standard.

If I had shouted today, I had mentioned nature, the animals and the climate. But at that time I hadn't yet had my climate awakening. It came later, by spring 2008, soon after the actions.

I think we need more actions of this kind, if we shall be able to turn around our Titanic. We need heroic sacrifices, people who risk their freedom with civil disobedience, as Sini Saarela * from Greenpeace. She is one of the heroes of our time. But who wants to sacrifice their convenience ? I call for people to make sacrifices. Everything we do has significance, it may be too late to rescue humanity, but other species and the planet can still be rescued if we diminish our ecological footprint. But watch out for coming between the wheels in our machinery of death. It rolls on as if there is no other goal than infinite growth. Blessed be all the martyrs who have been crumbled by that machine.

It's cumbersome to refrain from our royal throne in the west. One suddenly enters the same sphere where the poor in the third world are, and the animals and nature. The beggars. Those who beg for mercy from those who are sitting on the lifestyle throne. One becomes among those who shout. Who shout for liberation. I wonder whether there sometimes mixes up a wish for justice in these cries. That Mother Earth will administer justice. Maybe my shouting in the churches could be interpreted as « may you never sleep at night as long as you oppress the poor ! » And I also think that there stealthily is a justice in the midst of all. That the poor actually can be happier than the rich. The rich have so much to loose and to worry about, and nonetheless a punishing bad conscience behind all. Isn't a good conscience the most essential in being happy ?

The environmental guru James Lovelock suggests that at the end of the century, when he believes that humanity has shrunked to one billion, Mother Earth will breath a sigh of relief. Yes, even more if the predictions of Guy McPherson are realized, if all humanity go extinct in a few decades. Even if most of the species would go extinct together with humanity, there is a strong hope that Mother Earth will bounce back, in some hundred thousand years, or even million years. But we have to fight now so that as many species as possible will survive humanity, so that the mass extinction doesn't exceed the permian extinction event (and we can do much better than this !), the greatest mass extinction in the history of earth, 250 million years ago, when 83 % of the species went extinct, and it took ten million years for the earth to recover. The cause of this mass extinction was the same as what we see today; global warming. Therefore one can hope that all life doesn't die this time, in « the sixth mass extinction », said in official language.

* Sini Saarela was one of the Greenpeace-activists who managed to get on-board on a russian oildrilling platform in the

Arctic 2013 to demonstrate against oildrilling in the Arctic. The activists were arrested and had to sit two months in russian prison (on remand) before they were released. They were suspected for huliganism.

The meaning of my life

The meaning of my life; to work for a world which will not become too heavy to carry for our children's grandchildren.

What the monuments of civilization are

The monuments of civilization are monuments of oppression, because at the same time they were built, people on the other side of the globe were without food. The power which should have gone to nourishing the poor and protecting nature went instead to the megalomaniac monuments of civilization.

The collapse: a liberation

"...from an ecological viewpoint, and, above all else, from a long-term social perspective, an economic crash is our best hope », David Jonstad writes on "Effektbloggen" ("the effect blog"). Yes, not only would it be good for the climate, nature and other species, but also for the third world it would be a liberation, because in a collapse, globalization would slow down, and this would relieve considerably the pressure of west on the third world, its theft of the food of the third world, its resources and its work force.

Walking barefoot – a silent revolt against civilization

I walk much barefoot. Walking barefoot is a silent revolt against civilization. It's free, and accessible for everyone, spring, summer and autumn. It conserves the shoes, and is healthy for the feet (no foot sweat!) I wonder why I so seldom meet someone who walks barefoot. It is a little link to our old golden age.

Some words from David Wasdell

"It is a crime against humanity and against life itself to continue emitting carbon dioxide from our industrial processes..."

(climate researcher David Wasdell)

"We are now in the early stages of runaway Climate Change".

(David Wasdell, in 2008)

Civilization: Heaven and hell upside-down

It's something wrong with our world. Much is upside-down. Those who damage the planet most and mess up the climate most, the rich and the westerners, have built themselves a heaven on earth, with luxury homes, luxury cars, computers and iPhones. The nature abusers, the real criminals, live in « heaven » *. Whom do you find in hell? Yeah, mostly those whose ecological footprint is minimal, like nonhuman, endangered species, and poor people in the third world, who work all day long for their survival and scarcely have food.

It wasn't hardly supposed to be like this, from the beginning, was it? The imagined heaven and hell of the Middle Ages was built so that Christ and his holy people, the good ones, were sitting and ruling in heaven, in the sky, while the hell was under the earth and was populated by evil, lost people and demons who ate on them and tortured them.

What has happened? Why are the criminals now in heaven (1), and the good ones in hell? Is this because those who have been in power at all times also have had the power to frame heaven and hell, and have had the power to place themselves in heaven and the disobedient and poor in hell? Doesn't the very doctrine of hell derive from those who have had the power, i.e. mostly tyrants and abusers of power? They have prophesied about how it will go for humanity after the final judgment, of course with themselves in heaven, and it has become something of a self-fulfilling prophecy. The secular man hasn't at all liberated himself from Middle Age superstition, but has lived it out to something almost as grotesque as what we see on Middle Age paintings of heaven and hell.

But the heaven of the evil ones is fragile. They maintain it only through flatly denying that hell exist, and that the good are in hell. Not maybe in theory, but in practice. It's something that gnaws inside them, ghost areas in the periphery about which they don't want to know. Their happiness is resting on other's unhappiness, but they deny this flatly. The bad conscience gnaws somewhere secretly.

The hell of the good ones is also fragile. They have namely that which was meant to give people a heaven ; a good conscience. And all the time heaven is peeking through in their hell. Pauses in the heavy work, or simply meaningful work that stays in direct relation to the useful – survival. They are not so much plagued by meaningless work, as many rich are, who trim their wealth, while 150-200 species go extinct every day.

There is thus a justice, a regulating element in the midst of the meaningless. And when civilization collapses, I imagine the roles reversed. The poor and the suffering welcome the end, it becomes their Nirvana, their return to self-sufficiency, while the rich and the westerners deny the end "till the bitter end". The end of civilization becomes the hell for the rich.

* I don't say that all rich westerners are criminals, I think more of things like executives of oil- and coal companies, Monsanto (companies which generates genetically engineered crops), corrupt bankers and buyers, executives of the forest industry and so on...

(1) I don't say "evil", because I don't think anybody is evil, because we have no free will.

One's own salvation is not the most important thing

The religious (especially the fundamentalists) are usually very busy with their own salvation, that they will go to heaven and not to hell when they die. To come there one follows the religious rules scrupulously, even if it means environmental destruction, colonialism (mission) and impoverishment of the third world, oppression of the homosexuals, oppression of women and so on. What the scriptures say is what is important. If only oneself goes to heaven, everything is okay. If that results in other humans, other species and nature having to suffer, that is, lose salvation (at least here on earth), it's not so important (at least in practice, in theory they would dispute this)

The non-religion I advocate, where Nature, or Mother Earth, is the god that one serves, there the own salvation is not the primary goal. The most important is that life itself is saved, that Nature and biodiversity is saved from suffering and extinction, that our children and grandchildren are saved, i.e. get access to a world where it's possible to live, where the climate hasn't been destroyed. Even if one oneself go under in the process, it's not the most important that oneself gets saved. Man doesn't stand in the centre, and least of all oneself. Life stands at the centre. Everything has to be sacrificed in order to save Life itself.

The arrogance of the religious, where the own salvation stands at the centre, reminds of the arrogance of humanism, where everything revolves around man ("man is the measure of all things"), even if that would mean the destruction of countless other species and life itself. I have left humanism since I discovered this speciesistic (sort of "specie-racistic") arrogance.

Many Christians (as for example pentecostals) think that Jesus has sacrificed himself once and for all, so then we don't need to sacrifice ourself. I'm more inclined to the "imitation of Christ-theology", that we have to follow the example of Christ (even if I believe he is a mythical figure and hasn't existed in history) and sacrifice ourselves for the salvation of the world, for the salvation of the creation. Then we might go deliberately into a short time of hell (it might maybe feel hellish in the beginning when one abandons all one's riches and comfort, but one gets used to it, I promise!) to give heaven to others. It's something else than the heaven of the religious, which often occurs so that the third world, other species and our grandchildren go to hell because of the luxurious, "heavenly" lifestyle of the religious, not least in USA.

Humanity has become like a cancer on the body of Mother Earth

"Growth for the sake of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell."

(the anarchist author Edvard Abbey)

Humanity has become like a cancer on the body of Mother Earth. Either Mother Earth gets rid of this cancer so that she herself doesn't die, or then she dies, so that the cancer dies with her.

A. Kent McDougall, professor in journalism at the University of California, has written an article named "Humans as cancer". There he writes about the unexpectedly many parallels between civilization and a cancer tumour. It is despairing to read.

Humanity multiplies just like a cancer, aggressively, unrestrainedly, out of control.

MacDougall mentions for example the parallel between the "metastasis" of a cancer tumour (how the cancer spreads to other parts of the body through the blood circulation) and the colonialism that characterizes civilization.

What else can you do than compare civilization with aggressive cancer when one considers that 150-200 species go extinct every day? Because of the unrestrained growth of civilization!

How does one become a healthy cell inside a cancer tumour? Wouldn't one be destroyed by the surrounding cancer cells if one suddenly would change from a cancer cell to a healthy cell? Well, a cancer cell eats up the surrounding healthy cells, and multiplies unrestrainedly.

Sorry, the unrestrained growth of internet is cancerous. And the activities therein, also, mostly.

Cancer can in certain circumstances produce fever in the body. Humanity has also given rise to fever in the body of Mother Earth: global warming. Another parallel between cancer and the behaviour of humanity. There is a risk that runaway climate change (which is already under way) gives rise to a climate on earth similar to that on Venus, that is, gives rise to a dead planet (for example climate scientist James Hansen has worried about this). In that case the cancer tumour of humanity will kill Mother Earth. I earnestly hope that this will not happen, even if I'm conscious of the risk, so big has the cancer tumour of humanity grown. There are researchers on the internet who propose that this will happen, like Malcolm Light and Jennifer Hynes. I however hope that the "Sixth extinction" that we live through today, at least will not become worse than the Permian mass extinction.. That is also what Guy McPherson on the blog "Nature Bats Last" believes and wishes for. I really don't hope that a Permian mass extinction will happen, only that it will not become worse than that.

Every eco-act is important now to avoid the Venus-scenario, and at least not make it worse than a Permian mass extinction of the species on the earth. I would really prefer to avoid a mass extinction. But I believe, as McPherson, that a scenario of this sort is unavoidable, because of the feedback loops that the carbon emissions of humanity have caused. I also doubt that humanity has free will considered as a whole. It will go over the cliff. I see few or no signs of anything else than this.

Civilization is collective madness

One can say that the psychosis is a sort of mental cancer. But there is benign and malicious cancer. The individual psychosis, that only one human has, is like a benign cancer, very mild, and often not so destructive. The collective psychosis, that which is shared by most people in our civilization, is like a malicious cancer, terribly destructive. In comparison with its destructivity,

the individual psychosis is like a piss in the ocean. Yet one is punished only for having an individual psychosis, never for partaking in the collective psychosis, even though the latter destroys the very conditions for life, the very health of the planet (think global warming). Partaking in the collective psychosis is considered by most as even sane, yes it is even encouraged by politicians, legislation and advertisement. But poor thing who has an individual psychosis, he/she can end up in a closed psychiatric institution and get medication that in the beginning is a true plague (according to my own experience of these). So upside-down is our world.

If you want to know where the collective psychosis has its most important bastions, go to a shopping centre and compare this with the homeless beggar on the street outside. Or go to a service in some bombastically beautiful church, and listen to the psychotic nonsense that is served there in so called "sermons" and "prayers". And consider that Sweden not long ago had a state church, that is, was a Christian country. The Christian religion in its fundamentalist and fanatic form is a malicious mental cancer, and one of the biggest factors that has contributed to the emergence of the industrial civilization, with its theology that man stands above nature and has the right to rule over all other life.

The individual psychosis almost always passes away, but not the collective psychosis. It persists until one has sawed off the branch one is sitting on. Civilization: a herd of mad pigs throwing themselves off a cliff.

What also characterizes the collective psychosis of the civilized, is their loose ties to nature, the nature which in fact is reality itself (everything comes from there), that no one can avoid. Only the fact that the civilized speak about themselves and nature as something separate, speaks for itself.

How civilization disturbs the balance in nature

In wild nature, most is in balance. There is balance between life and death, between summer and winter, between youth and old age, between what is easy and what is difficult. The one doesn't work without the other. But civilization only wants the first. It only wants to have life, only summer, only youth, only easy things. Most dramatically it appears in the notion of the Christians of an eternal life and an eternal bliss.

It doesn't work. There will be imbalance. One borrows from life, and from the future, and gets therefore debt to life, a debt whose payment one postpones to the future. If one only wants to know about life, and not death, then one gets a death debt. One owes nature deaths *. If one only wants the easy, one gets a difficulty-debt. One owes nature the heavy and difficult. But one postpones the payment as long as possible. It often ends with an abrupt catastrophe, a fast suicide, a fast collapse.

It can all be illustrated by how one treats one's teeth. It's doubtlessly boring to carefully brush one's teeth every day. But if one doesn't do it, one gets a debt to the teeth, which at last is paid with toothache and difficult visits to the dentist. But if one every day pays a little amount to the teeth, that consists in enduring a little moment of teeth brushing, then one doesn't need to pay the great amount that the debt to the teeth brings.

Those who want only happiness in life, and don't want to know about sorrow, gets the same set of problems as a drug addict. It's possible to rampantly enjoy the drug until a certain limit. Then the drug runs out, or one doesn't get "high" anymore. And if one stops being on drugs, one has to pay all the debt to the body that the unrestrained bat on the drug has created.

Civilization is an oil alcoholic, a drug addict on oil (and coal and natural gas for that matter). It works as long as the oil lasts, and as long as civilization is young and healthy. But there will come a moment where we have to pay our gigantic debt to nature, which comes from our rampant bat on cheap oil, because we have only wanted the easy, cheap and gladsome (1). When civilization gets older, it doesn't get the same kicks from the oil as when it was young, and moreover the oil begins to deplete. But the longer one delays paying one's debt to nature, the worse the collapse will be.

It's not sustainable to only want the easy and gladsome. We have to get used to life being a little difficult sometimes. Then we don't need to pay the gigantic debt to nature when the gladsome depletes. If we endure the winters in tipis instead of heated houses, then we doesn't need to pay back the debt that is heaped up by power plants and electricity, through the heaping up of problems in the form of nuclear waste and carbon emissions. The roe deers also endure the cold, winter after winter, in balance with the ecosystem. Civilization has lost this lifestyle of the roe deers. They don't want to know about any winter, or any winter suffering, with their heated houses. And that creates huge emissions of carbon from the power plants (in most parts of the world), and the environment is hurt, so that a habitat is created where it's too heavy to live in in the long run, a planet with fever.

The really poor however, those who all the time collapses a bit, they won't suffer so much when civilization collapses. They are used to collapse. They have no debt to nature to pay. For them collapse and death might instead imply a liberation. But think of how the rich will suffer, when civilization collapses. They are those who have the biggest debt to nature, and therefore will suffer most. It will be a huge fall. They will be like prisoners who try to remove their chains when the boat sinks, like in the Ben Hur-movie. The poor have no such chains, they can freely save themselves in life boats. The life boat – it's the ability to adapt to Mother Earth. The rich ones are not adapted to Mother Earth. In the wild nature there are no rich ones. There everyone is poor like Francis of Assisi. To be committed to poverty, that is to refrain from borrowing from nature, to refrain from loan servitude, from becoming a loan prisoner, a bond servant. Poverty is the price of freedom. Everything has a price. But civilization doesn't want to know about any price. It has got oil out of the ground almost freely for 150 years by now. It has partied unrestrainedly on cheap oil. But it was oil which coming generations would have needed to build a sustainable world. Civilization has borrowed, not only from nature, but also from coming human generations. It will be difficult for the rich ones to look into the eyes of their grandchildren.

* This doesn't mean that we have the right to exterminate people or that we ought to commit suicide. We can, however, effectively treat our death debt to nature by most of us refraining to have children. This is already to die a little, but it's not destructive.

(1) Paradoxically it's heavier to live as a civilized than to live as a savage, given how much most civilized have to work. But I think primarily of the upper classes.

We have to dare to err

We have to dare to err. Civilization can't stand any errors. It is totalitarian "hygiene" and perfection. We have to dare to err, dare to fumble a little in the darkness, otherwise we'll never find the closed opening towards the light. Civilization can't stand that we move, fumble. It wants us stiffening into perfection as a statue or a robot. It cracks down on us immediately when we begin to fumble, to err. But we have to err to get across.

We have to dare to live dangerously, dare the plunge into the darkness. Maybe we will never arrive, but then we have lived, at least.

Civilization is so afraid of death that it has become afraid of life itself, for the fumbling, stuttering. lamb-stuttering life, the weakness in the fragile life. It can't stand life, can't stand the wild, can't stand the great, wild forests, but wants to convert all primeval forests to croplands, or tree plantations for the forest industry.

Civilization doesn't even stand that one thinks erroneously, if you think too erroneously, you get locked into a psychiatric institution. But we have to dare to fumble, dare to think a little erroneously, dare to post a little crazy blog posts for the sake of the climate, because our planet is sick from lack of life, where most have died, become civilized.

We have to stand in the way of this awful machinery of civilization, dare to sabotage this life hating industry of death, which wants to kill everything that is wild, everything that is "a little wrong". But Mother Earth cares about and loves everyone who is a little wrong, all retarded, all knock-kneed pigeons, all predators, all savages. The only Mother Earth can't manage, is the perfection machinery "Civilization". It is so wrong that "wrong" becomes too weak a word. Civilization is a sky screaming catastrophe. A tower of Babel that has reached heaven, so that man has begun to play God, the ultimate imaginable hubris.

Because of civilization countless humans and other species live in hellish conditions. Yes, civilization threatens the very survival of the planet. We have to sabotage this, and dare to err.

In the wild nature there are no errors. Because what is "wrong" is used by nature as a benefit for the natural cycle. It's a bit like the fact that there is no dirt in nature. It's civilization that has made up the dirt and the errors, because civilization is the only thing that is really dirty, really wrong.

Down with the tyranny!

The return of nature

I miss the great forests from the time they were numerous on earth. I would gladly sacrifice much to get back something of the ancient primeval forests, even if that would mean giving up my comfort. I dream about a humanity that is noble enough for the "decreation" – the term the christian philosopher-mystic Simone Weil (1909-1943) used for "stepping aside" so that other life than oneself can get room. Like that she imagined God having created the world. I dream about humanity being able to step aside, so that non-human life could flourish again, that we could imitate the God of Simone Weil. I dream about us letting the croplands become forests again. So that Nature could make comeback. Namely, we don't need the return of any human, no second coming of Jesus. We need the return of Nature, fervently. That Mother Earth could survive the fever, the climate change, after humanity has gone extinct, and then recover.

The desperate slaves of civilization

There is a scene in the movie "Ben Hur", where Ben Hur's galley has been attacked by pirates, and begins to sink. The slaves who row the boat are chained to the floor of the boat, and begin trying to remove the chains so they can avoid drowning. They then sink with the boat. In the same way there will be a lot of people who try to remove their chains when civilization sinks, and falls. Their whole life has circled around civilization, so much that when civilization falls, they fall. I think this will happen especially for the rich part of the western world. For the rich the fall of civilization is their fall. The poor, especially in the third world, are already on the bottom, for them the collapse might instead be a liberation, especially for indigenous people and poor peasants, because they have invested in nature, for example in cultivation and handicrafts. For them the fall of civilization is the same as access to soil to cultivate – what they have been interested in from the beginning – selfsufficiency. The rich ones seldom have such interests. They lose everything they have invested in; oil companies, coal and natural gas, nuclear power plants, all kinds of industries, luxuries and so on. The interests of the poor lies close to the earth, nature, and is not disturbed as much by a collapse of civilization. Certain indigenous peoples in the forests would hardly notice the collapse of civilization, if it collapsed today. It's worse in the distant future, when climate change gets really dangerous. Then, supposedly, everyone will gradually be affected as much. But there is a big chance that civilization collapses long before climate change kills it, because of depleting oil, natural gas and coal. It is also what I wish for, because it would not only be good for the poor in the world, but also for the climate. It would give oss more time before the climate kills us.

Therefore I encourage you to get poor and invest in things close to nature before the collapse arrives! Because the collapse will come, it's not a question of if, but when, and the sooner, the better. Either resource scarcity (Peak Oil, Peak Coal and Peak Natural gas) takes us, or climate change takes us. "*We can't sustain the unsustainable forever*" (Guy McPherson)

But even in a collapse caused by climate change the poor ones and the suffering ones have an advantage over the rich of the world. The former are already used to collapse, and might

consider death as a liberation. To be poor and close to nature also means to be close to death, a friend with death.

Long live the fragile life!

When I take the bus, it's the small irregularities in the road that makes the bus cradle me as in a womb, and gets me to enjoy the bus trip. It's the same with life in common, it's the small deficiencies, the small cracks in the asphalt, where the dandelions grow, that makes life worth living, that reminds us that life exists, that everything isn't only petrified life, i.e., civilization. Long live the fragile and weak life! Let us embrace weakness, because if there is something that will save our planet from dying, it is solidarity with everything that is weak, combined with a certain contempt for everything that is big, flashy and bombastic, yes invulnerable. Nature is vulnerable, unlike civilization (temporarily), nature gets easily fever. But civilization only goes on and goes on, wearing its armour, technology, until it has sawed off the branch it's sitting on, i.e. until Mother Earth collapses. We can only save Mother Earth through ourselves becoming weak and vulnerable, with risk of collapsing. But if we collapse, it's worth remembering that it's into Mother Earths bosom we collapse, she is on our side in the collapse. All in life is on our side, everything but civilization, which has placed itself outside of life, become enemy with life itself. But the physical reality is on our side, our body is on our side (think of the healing powers in your body), everything that is true and real is. Civilization is not real, it is a thoughtvirus, a sickness, a cancer, an unreal thought-matrix. Civilization is a flight from reality, as irrational as religion. It's the dream about the big, bombastic, invulnerable, perfect life. It doesn't want to know anything about weakness and fragility, doesn't want to know about the end, death. But for Mother Earth death is not dangerous, it is a part of life, one of the conditions for life. If death would be dangerous, then life itself would be something evil, because life builds on death. But we know from good experience that existence is something good, that is has immensely powerful healing powers. It's only civilization which is a wound which doesn't heal, a cancer that doesn't cease. If civilization were the only that existed, yes then existence would truly be evil. Likewise if there would be eternal hells. But death makes all suffering ending once. Life stands on our side, life is something good. Hence love of life, hence the fight to avoid death. But when we are satisfied with life, and have done what we had to do, then we welcome death, because we know that deep down it is on the side of life, is something good.

The boring state

I think most of what the state does is totally boring. And I think most of what the wild nature does is very exciting! The state – the wild nature – two extremes.

I think ecology and ecophilosophy are very exciting. But when the state takes it in its mouth, it often gets boring. It becomes dry science. When the state shall be green, the question is almost always about new technology. That technology will save us. That I regard as a boring pipe dream. Much more exciting is to return to the lifestyle of the indigenous people, in Sweden to the

life style of the old time Sapmi people. And quit wage slavery. Grow one's own food.

And I have noticed one thing. Those who are engaged in boring things, they also themselves become boring.

The silver glance

Whatever the state gets to grips with is converted to ashes and waste. Everything becomes boring in the hands of state and establishment. Take for example morality. In the hands of the state it's converted to totally boring, dry, thick statute books.

However, whatever the wild nature gets to grips with and incorporates with her, is converted to gold. Poop becomes nutritious soil, the gold of the forest, in the hands of the forest.

Abandoned cities soon blossom in the hands of the wild nature, and the bulwarks and the walls are filled with beautiful moss and lovely climbers.

It is because the wild nature has the "silver glance", which the Christian mystic Hjalmar Ekström (1885-1962) spoke about. It's the Christ-glance that denudes everything its true being, that sees inside everything, that sees behind and through everything, so that one sees the value of the small things in the everyday life, yes even in waste and poop. The silver is in the small, despised things, according to the silver glance. The silver glance has no sense for the flashy and the bombastic. Its glance is underground, it sees everything with an underground-glance, in order that what the humans in civilization scorn, it makes the most of, as for example poop, garbage and food waste. I see for example that dogs have the silver glance. They live off the small things that civilization scorn and doesn't seize, for example the pee smell of other dogs in the corners and around pillars and trees. Homeless people also have such a glance, sometimes.

Getting the silver glance is quite crucial for the future of earth. It is in the small things of the everyday life where the future of the earth is decided. By common citizens. The politicians won't save us. We have to be faithful in the small things, if there shall be any change. Because the big context is made of billions of humans who make small choices. Not to eat meat. Not to drive a car, scarcely train, bus or subway. Go, ride by bike. Live in huts, tipis and tents. Not use electricity. Take care of garbage, compost the food and poop. Water with the pee. We have to see the value in these small acts, see them with the silver glance. Then we become faithful in the small things.

Self-strictness

Either we are strict against ourselves, through refraining from the comfort and luxury of civilization, or Mother Earth will be strict against us – when she is dying, and doesn't feed us any more. There is no escape from strictness. Life is hard sometimes. Nature is barren. Think of how the roe deers endure winter after winter. I think it's incredible. Couldn't we then endure the winters in huts, tipis and tents, a little in imitation of the roe deers? There is nothing cheap in nature. Everything has its price.

But I think we have only the right to be strict against ourselves, and pioneer with an example. I don't think we have the right to be strict against others (except when it involves criminality *). Everything must be voluntary. But it can be useful to enlighten those who want to escape cheaply that they only gather the strictness to the end, if they doesn't now practice self-strictness. It is like those who try to escape the brushing of their teeth, and in the end have to pay for expensive and painful dental visits.

Similarly it is with death. If we die before death, we don't die when we die, the old mystics said. The way we sweep death under the carpet results in death debt, we owe nature deaths. Eventually the debt becomes so big that a lot of humans die like flies, when Mother Earth begins to die.

* The problem is just that the nature-destructive, western lifestyle is inherently criminal, even if it isn't like that in the eyes of the country's law. So we surely have to be strict against those who for example travel by airplane and overconsume.

Something about utopia and morality

Civilization has sunk so deeply into darkness that it regard the original state, the normal state for man, the one we lived in during most of the history of humanity, to be **utopian**. Thus it dismisses every demand for radical change and dismantling. But even if this state would be utopian today, we have to hold to this ideal if we shall have any chance of acting morally. Acting morally namely feeds mainly on utopias, on the high goals one strives for. It is the utopias which give morality its direction. Everyone works for some utopia, even if one doesn't admit it. The foremost utopia of civilization is for example "endless growth". A complete impossibility. In comparison with that to long for the original state of man is pure realism.

Climate and the categorical imperative of Immanuel Kant

There is an important reason for why I now move to the forest, to live in my little hut in Nackareservatet and my cave in the forest outside of Stockholm. This reason is in philosophical language "The categorical imperative of Immanuel Kant", and implies "*Acting only according to the maxim whereby you also may want it to become a public law*" (Wikipedia)

It is because few follow this imperative, that we see the climate being disrupted more and more. We westerners don't simply walk our talk, we are bad examples for others with our emissions. We namely have to act in a way so the third world also might follow our lifestyle, with satisfactory results, i.e. so we can save the climate.

As long as we don't radically, in our lifestyle, reject the western lifestyle with its high emissions, the climate won't be saved. It's as simple as this. We have to dismantle the whole civilization, if the climate shall have any chance, and even then it might be too late. But even if it would be too late, we yet have to live so that we destroy as little as possible. We don't know whether other species than humans can survive after man has gone extinct. We have to live as if we could relieve the damages that we have afflicted Mother Earth and other species because of climate change, and if nothing else, anyway buy these some

more time. Every eco-act is important, because of this. We can't escape through saying that it's too late to save the climate.

Isn't it quite clear that the only humans on our earth that live sustainably, are the indigenous people, or those among them who still hold on to the lifestyle of their wild ancestors? Why do we not begin to live like them? What's the problem? Why are acts not rewarded which intend to regain the lifestyle of the indigenous people, like building forest gardens (and letting cropland become forests), and living in tents, tipis, small huts and yurts?

Something about animalism

"From animal you come, and animal you shall again become."

I have now struggled for many years with my philosophy "animalism" *, which I invented 2010 and presented in my book "Animalistic theology" by the same year. Sometimes I have rejected it, and sometimes I have embraced it. It's so radical and so far off that it's easy to be ashamed of it. Today I embrace it from the bottom of my heart, but it's time for some updates regarding the definition of it. It follows here:

Animalism is a philosophy created by forest man Lars Larsen, who suggests that man is an animal among other animals (don't stand above the other animals), but has departed from his animal origins and built civilization instead, which implies an oppression of our animal nature, an alienation from our animal nature. We are ashamed of our animal nature. And we have come to consider ourselves as something above the other animals, as something other than an animal. It even resides in our everyday language, where we distinguish between animals and humans.

The salvation is, according to this philosophy, beginning to again live in harmony with one's animal nature through "rewilding", dismantling civilization and living like the wild animals and the indigenous people, or rather those of them who live according to the uncivilized lifestyle of their wild ancestors. The animals are considered as the moral examples of man, all animals live in harmony with their nature, their origins, and can show the way back to the wild for man, to the animalistic and natural. The animalistic is not considered by animalism as something shameful, "the lower nature of man", the emblem of everything "low" and perverse, no, animalism suggests that the animals, according to an ecological approach, live a highly moral life, because they live in harmony with the ecosystem, through their asceticism and their instinctively chosen poverty. Animalism criticizes speciesism (sort of "specie-racism") and suggests that man should not be the lord of the animals, but he should be their equal and their follower, yes the animals are ahead of the civilized in moral matters, because they doesn't destroy their and other's life conditions, the ecosystem. Man is about to destroy the planet, as we see for example in global warming.

Animalism suggests that all animals, both wild and domesticated, have the indigenous right to be free in nature, without stalls and ties, and that it is a great shame for humanity that they have animals in captivity at all. The goal of animalism is to recreate the old great primeval forests, and let the croplands

grow into forests again, and likewise the animals in captivity slowly but surely should be released into these forests. That's the "utopia" which animalism strives for. And it means that even if this is unachievable, morality should get its direction from this goal, we need to strive towards this, even if it would mean the collapse of civilization (However, I advocate a controlled degrowth, controlled dismantling of civilization).

Animalism doesn't suggest that the animals are morally perfect, only that they instinctively have what constitutes the core of all morality; respect for life, taking care of the ecosystem, the conditions for life. All moral strife is in vain if only this single thing is lacking. And if this is part of morality, all the minor moral lapses are secondary. It's a question of finding the core, the essentials, in morality, which I, with the theologian Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965), suggest is "reverence for life". In this regard we have to imitate the animals, and live as free, "noble savages" in the forests.

* There is already a philosophical notion of "animalism" in the english speaking world, a notion meaning that man is an animal. For example the philosopher Eric T. Olson has written about this. My animalism has a broader sense, and is a translation of the swedish word, "djurism", which is different from the word "animalism" in swedish.

Civilization is a coarsening process

In the wild nature there is a constant refinement- and coming alive-process going on, everything constantly becomes just more and more refined and beautiful during the evolutionary process. This is the reason why swans and old untouched primeval forests can be so enchanting, fabulously beautiful.

However, in civilization there is a constant uglifying- and coarsening process going on, everything constantly becomes more and more coarse and ugly. This is why postmodern cities and new ware houses can be so desperately ugly, and this is why postmodern poetry, music and art can be so hollow and ugly, to the point of the artists even being proud of the ugly, elevating the ugly. Civilization alienates itself increasingly from the organic life and is more and more absorbed into the mechanical, technological and machinal, that explains the coarsening process. The organic is namely incomparably more refined than the machinal, mechanical life. And I have also noticed, that humans who work much with machines, for example building workers, have a tendency to be coarse in their soul. Where the living, creative, organic life sprout, as for example in culture workers, philosophers, poets, artists and librarians, one finds much more refined souls, where the really innovative happens, and it's also there one can find the conscience of civilization. Building workers, for example, are no conscience for civilization in their work, they just obey orders. If one only obeys order, one gets a coarsened and petrified soul, which more resembles a machine than organic life. One has almost to be a poet or a philosopher – be able to enough distance oneself from the machinal – to have courage and character and intellect to criticize it.

I have also observed that too heavy work coarsens the soul. When one has bitten the bullet enough, and whipped oneself enough to obey one's bosses, one has a tendency to demand this from others too, so that they also have to behave like machines. Thus the coarsening is spread like a cancer tumour.

I don't think we are created for hard work. There are paleo-anthropological studies which indicate that stone age man worked only two to four hours a day with hunting and gathering of food. I have in my own work as cleaner discovered that five hours of work is the maximum amount of work before one gets tired. So the Stone Age man never broke his balls. And we are not created for that. We should namely have time over for what is most important in life; culture and social relations. Nature and the organic life are mild in comparison with the death machinery and slavery machinery of "Civilization".

The western, rich man believes that he/she is rich when he/she owns all the gadgets, a luxury car and a luxury house. But he/she is impoverished in what I suggest is the only true wealth; time to refine the soul. My father, for example, has never had time to educate himself, because he has had enough with taking care of all his riches, his many cars and his big house. This time to educate myself I have found in the loophole inside civilization where I ended up during my time as homeless and living in the forest. And it is in order to find this time for the refining of the soul, I again move to the forest to become a forest man (I wrote this 2015). I want to be a part of the creative, refined, organic life, not a part of the petrified, machinal.

The scientists are like missionaries of civilization

Science has, throughout the ages, had a big part in the colonisation of nature and the third world. The role of the scientists resembles greatly the role of the missionaries in newly formed colonies, they cleared the ground for the actual colonisation, without knowing that they did it, yes in our time the scientists often want to save the areas they are researching, and the animals they are researching, from civilization (so for example the anthropologists who want to protect the indigenous people they are researching). But they are yet clearing, through their knowledge, the ground for the growth of civilization in the areas they are researching, in the long run. But when the colonial rulers once have knowledge about the area/peoples/animals, then the road is cleared for manipulating and controlling them. I have great respect for science as a clearing away of magical thinking, but unfortunately the scientists only feed another kind of magical thinking; the belief in the infinite growth of civilization, in capitalism, consumerism and the religion of money.

Animalism in its relation to anarchoprimitivism

For you who don't know it, anarchoprimitivism is a philosophy which advocates the dismantling of civilization and a return to a primitive lifestyle, inspired by the Stone Age * and modern indigenous peoples who live close to nature. Animalism considers itself as part of anarchoprimitivism, it's only a radicalized version of it. It would like to go further back than anarchoprimitivism often is willing to go, as far as back to the

animal kingdom, competing with the other animals on equal terms. This is only possible through a far driven pacifism, to renounce all the tools that place us above the other animals and give us power and control over them. Animalism implies that we deliberately refrain from all killing that is not absolutely necessary, a form of radical pacifism. Not even mosquitoes should be killed if it's not absolutely necessary. And we should wait with hunting until the ecosystem has recovered. Mostly small scale fishing. All more advanced weapons should be destroyed. If we use them, we risk driving animal species to extinction, because we are so numerous.

Animalism also implies that humanity (deliberately) should shrink drastically, so that everyone could live in the warm and fruitful parts of the world – the true home of all humans. Thus we should shrink the population and move south, and live like the vegetarian gorillas, where fruits, nuts (especially coconuts), juicy stalks and other wild plants are our main food (eventually also a little fish, insects, worms and caterpillars).

Animalism, unlike anarchoprimitivism generally, is not so fond of fire. It was by means of fire that we produced advanced weapons, and treating fire is behind many big forest fires. I suggest that we shouldn't use fire if it's not absolutely necessary. It's a part of my radical pacifism, to be careful with potentially destructive things. If we live in the warm parts of the world, something we should do, we actually don't need fire (except for a few things, like pottery), if we really think about it (in fact man lived without fire for a very long time in the tropics, as simian), and therefore we should not threaten the precious forests, which themselves need most of their timber as fertiliser for the soil and for the biodiversity (and nowadays for storing carbon dioxide in the soil). If all of humanity would burn firewood, it's soon game over for the forests (moreover, the risk for forest fires increases dramatically), especially in areas with little forest. The solution would be not to prepare the food, but eat like the monkeys, i.e. raw food. Likewise, if everyone would hunt, it would soon be game over for the wild animals, therefore man should not hunt until the ecosystem has recovered, and the number of humans has shrunk radically. Mostly small scale fishing is recommended (fish can be eaten raw, too!).

Animalism also resists religion (1), also the one so beloved by anarchoprimitivists, animism, which one also finds in many indigenous peoples. Animalism suggests that organized religion is a sign of sickness (animals have no religion), a sign that evolution began to fail, that man began to alienate himself from nature, and behave cancerously. The religious thought may very well be a degeneration from the time we were equals to the other animals, and may well lie behind our growing exercise of power, the so called domestication (taming of animals). If we live as equals to the animals, the religious thought is simply not needed, and will perhaps slowly wither away.

Animalism has, because of its largely vegetarian lifestyle, a certain taste for horticulture and permaculture (2), especially forest gardens, which can be used in the transition from civilization to the original state as equals to the monkeys, but the point is that even these should be liberated to gradually rewilding themselves, at least in the northern, colder parts of the world (see next chapter) The goal of animalism is letting all croplands become forests, and then forest gardens serve as a hybrid between civilization and the original state, which makes humans survive the transition. The goal of animalism is

”paradisism”, recreating Eden, the methaphor for the ”parade-sical” original state of humanity. It doesn’t want to idealize this original state, it only suggests that it is a good deal better than civilization with its working days of eight hours, despite the struggle for existence that this original state shares with the rest of the animal kingdom. The paradisaical lies rather in the fact that this state doesn’t destroy the conditions of life (it’s a sustainable affluence), and doesn’t exploit the poor, as civilization does, and which now is threatening the survival of the whole planet. For every day civilization carries on it becomes more and more difficult to return to this original state, and the extinction of humanity, and maybe the death of the whole planet, becomes more likely. But morality demands from us that we nevertheless live as if this return, this Exodus from Egypt, is possible, minimizing the damage to Mother Earth.

* It has to be said that I don’t want to throw all the beneficial things we have learned from civilization in the trash can, but we should take the best of civilization and the best of Stone Age and fuse these together. But high technology is not the best we have learned from civilization, and is also difficult to unite with Stone Age. However, one finds tolerance, human rights, democracy, anarchism, socialism, equality and feminism among the best things civilization has taught us, and these are all things which are very easy to unite with the lifestyle of Stone Age and wild indigenous peoples, peoples which have many parallels to these things.

(1) With religion I mean belief in the ”supernatural”. I don’t mean nature spirituality (Mother-Earth-spirituality) or religious stratification in the secular culture, when it doesn’t believe in the supernatural, but instead has become inspired by certain religious notions and expressions, which it has secularized. I don’t suggest that we could become completely free from religion, because it’s difficult to distinguish between religion and other culture, one can’t draw a simple border, not least regarding indigenous people. One can wonder if not thinking and fantasy itself have religious implications. But it’s not such a religiosity I’m suggesting above, but an explicit belief in something ”supernatural”, paranormal, something ”beyond”.

(2) Permaculture is an ecological approach to existence, mostly in gardening, where one strives for sustainability, where one wants to work with instead of against nature, and imitate natural, sustainable ecosystems like forests. Man is here the cocreator of nature, who can make the ecosystem even more fertile and with even more biodiversity than in its wild state.

My idea for how to dismantle civilization

I have written extensively about dismantling of civilization and return to nature, which we need to do to save the planet and humanity. It’s a high ideal, but is it possible to implement? As I have developed and refined animalism, to be increasingly detailed, there has also been chiselled out an idea for how one would be able to dismantle civilization in a somewhat realistic manner. With this I want show that in principle it is possible to dismantle civilization, in small steps, if we have enough time. I suggest that we have to build bridges back to nature, we can’t just immediately leave civilization, and rush into the wild. The

idea which follows, is such a bridge. I am by no means willing to argue that this is possible to realise (perhaps we have not enough time), only that this is **what is required** if we want to save the world. The idea looks like this:

The first step is that the attitude towards death have to change in public, that death no longer should be considered as a enemy to fight, but as a friend who maintains balance in the ecosystem, and which creates room so that other life than humanity can grow.

What one should begin with then, would be to internationally (in a world parliament which one appoints for the purpose *) decide about a drastic reduction of the global population, to around one tenth of the present. This one could accomplish through campaigns and through making contraception free, and encourage people not to have children through rewarding them for that, for example give 1000 dollar every year to women who don’t get pregnant during their fertile time (money to this task would come partly through taxes for the rich ones, incomes from emission trading and fines for environmental criminals, like the oil companies). One would also reward sterilization, for example through letting those who accomplish a sterilization be liberated from paying taxes (it should pay off to be childless!). The goal would be that most of humanity (99 %) stopped having children (over a long period of time), and a small part continued, so that the survival of humanity was guaranteed, until we have become ten times fewer.

Euthanasia should become legal in all countries. Euthanasia doesn’t just end unbearable suffering with dignity, it is also beneficial for the planet, all animals and humans on it, because we become fewer in number, and thus relieve the pressure on the planet and the third world. But I don’t want to know about any forced euthanasia program, as the Nazis had, euthanasia should always be voluntary. And the euthanasia candidate should always be rewarded, because it is beneficial in several ways. The closest related should get compensation. Euthanasia clinics should be built.

If you come up with some better way to rapidly get the population number down, I welcome it. But it should, however, not be ecofascistic. But either we limit the population deliberately, or then we destroy nature and politics so that war, Peak Oil and climate change kill us.

When one tries to decrease population, one could simultaneously carry out a carbon dioxide rationing (or personal emission rights, as it’s also called), somewhat according to the model which David Jonstad advocates in the book ”Our fair share” (”Vår beskärda del”, Ordfront 2009). And slowly one should dismantle the industries as well, the most damaging and unnecessary first. The number of the rations would be lowered with time, as the population declines. And everything is rationed at last, even coffee, sugar and wheatmeal (coffee and sugar imports, among other things, should be dismantled compelety), as it was during the Second World War.

A gigantic depopulation of the cities would be implemented, through encouraging people to move to the countryside, through assigning them a cropland area to grow their own food on, so they can become selfsufficient. A great deurbanisation campaign would be launched. Lots of people would move to the countryside and form small towns of tipis, yurts and huts

(centered around ranches) on the croplands where they cultivate their own food, small scale, mostly according to the principles of permaculture. Transports would be virtually unnecessary, and one is also encouraged to reduce transports as a result of the carbon dioxide rationing system. Those who don't travel can sell their rations to those who still have to travel.

To revitalise the local economy, and the countryside, local currencies would be founded (beside the national and the supranational currencies), which only works locally, in a little area. Internationally, through the world parliament, "basic income" is introduced for all people in the world, also called "citizen's income", by the state putting every month an amount of "points" (of the local currency) on an account to every human in the world (it would be financed by for example income from emission rights and energy taxes), or giving every human an amount of point-coupons. This, prepared with the carbon dioxide rationing, would speed up the local economy, and contribute to equalising the differences between rich and poor in the world. Through this one would also avoid importing from the poor countries, more and more, so they can keep their production, and become more and more selfsufficient.

In the end even the points would be abolished, and a gift economy would be introduced.

We would annul all state debts, company debts and personal debts, globally, in a kind of Old Testament biblical "year of Jubilee", a "year of Grace", when all slaves were released and all debts written off.

We would also get the rights of nature into the law, so that environmental crimes would be prevented and punished. The business of oil companies and similar companies would through this act be stopped.

All rivers and creeks would be liberated from their dams, so that the fish in them (especially salmon) can recover.

As population numbers begins to decline, one would need smaller areas for agriculture. Surplus cropland would be changed to forest gardens and forests (not ordinary tree plantations, but forests with great biodiversity!) all over the world, so that more and more croplands in due course would become forests. At last, when only a tenth of the population is left, even the last croplands would be changed to forest gardens/forests, and then population would only live on what the forest gardens offer, which especially contain a lot of nut trees. One would also stop eating meat (however, one would still be fishing), and slowly release the domesticated animals into the great forests. One would put a lot of energy on research about animal "rewilding", and build up solutions for how the animals would tackle the winters. The fruits and berries of the forest gardens would be an important source of food for these animals.

Then, when the last animals are released (of those who can live in that climate), people (and certain animals) in the northern parts of the world would slowly move to the warm countries (1), mostly through wandering there through the summer months, but also in boats and cars. Then all Europe would be covered with big forests, mostly forest gardens, and the wandering peoples would feed themselves on the fruit- and nut trees from these forests. They would mostly wander to the tropics (which

also these days have a lot of forest gardens), along the coast of North Africa, Israel and the Nile, but also to the Mediterranean areas. Something similar would happen in America and Asia.

The climate has by now stabilized, because the emissions of carbon dioxide have declined radically, almost to zero (the carbon dioxide rationing has contributed heavily to this), and because most of the land area of the earth is now covered by forests, and the trees and the plants in the forests has bound a lot of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. This was one of the reasons why one had planted so much forests and forest gardens.

Most people live now in the tropics. Some would also stay in the North, guarding the nuclear power plants, which still need time to be shut completely down. They would also work with finding safe final storage places for the nuclear waste. But all other industries in the North would be closed. The last civilized instance that is shut down is the hospitals, and this only in the North. In the South the hospitals are still maintained some time after the Nordics have arrived, to ensure that everything will work out fine (indeed they should be maintained as long as possible, and then move on to "modern secular medicin men/women"). One would also maintain the euthanasia clinics some time yet.

After some time even the cities of the South are abandoned, and all humans all over the planet organize themselves in small tribes, settling down in the great forests in a way so the food (the fish, fruits and nuts from the forest gardens) suffices for everyone. One lives in small towns mostly, towns with mostly 150 persons, living in teepees, yurts, cots and huts. One also lives in regular houses in the countryside as long as it's possible. The towns are often centered around such regular houses on farms, where the house is the centre, surrounded by tipis, yurts and huts, like ecovillages. Most are pursuing cover crops and forest gardening according to the principles of permaculture.

The clothes begin to wear out, also the backpack, and gradually all begin to go naked around (in the tropics), because there are no cloth industries any more, all industries in the South have closed, and people don't want to hunt to get skins, in vain. People in South Europe make cloths of animal skins to protect themselves against the cold in the winter (they don't kill animals to get them, but they take them from carcasses, from animals who have died of their own accord or been killed by other animals). People don't want to have other tools than old daggers or knives, simple rods and bludgeons to defend themselves against predators (perhaps even stone axes and stone spears). They don't hunt, to find the balance with other species, because they are still so numerous that they could drive other animal species to extinction if they made use of the weapons of civilization (though, those hunt who always have lived in the wilderness, in big primeval forests, as the wild indigenous peoples, if they just avoid becoming too numerous). People feed on fruits, nuts, berries, juicy stalks, insects, caterpillars and bugs, everything that monkeys eat, and what one can catch with ones hands. One also fishes a lot, but it's small scale fishing, preventing overfishing of the watercourses.

There were people who had their little laptop and smartphone with them on the trip to South, and charged it with solar panels on their backpack. But as a result of the closing of the industries which were producing these gadgets, they can't buy new ones (money neither exists anymore) when the old machines are

worn out. Slowly but surely the technology and internet molder away, just like clothes on the body. Even science (the academic) molds away. "Conservation biology" is the last branch of science that molds away. The academic science was needed to save the world, but when the world is saved it's no longer needed. However, education goes on through what people tell each other from memory, and through visits in the numerous, disintegrating libraries in the ruinous cities of the South. But even the latter comes to an end when the buildings collapse and the books molder away. The world parliament also molds slowly away.

The circle is closed. Man has returned to nature and become an animal among other animals. Eden is recovered, the threat against Mother Earth is gone. The original forests and forest gardens of Europe are gradually transformed to gigantic primeval forests (2), and a new ice age sees the light of the day. Ice ages come and go, likewise natural catastrophes and mass extinctions, but the balance of the planet is maintained until the sun begins to cool off. Then there is not much left of the cities, houses and roads from the time of civilization. Nature has reconquered everything.

* I'm, however, an anarchist, but the world parliament would be a way to dismantle state and civilization, first on the local level, and then on a global level, a world parliament which would dismantle itself in the end, when civilization molds away. It would be extremely difficult to dismantle civilization and state without a world parliament. How would we otherwise f.ex. stop the neo-colonialists, or the global environmental criminals, like the oil companies? Without global laws they will pump up all available oil.

(1) When the next ice age comes, we have to return to the South anyway. And it is much more comfortable to spend the winters in the South. It is difficult to live as indigenous people in the north. Everyone wants to create a world which is better for one's grandchildren, and maybe somebody want to pay something of their debt to the wild nature?

I wrote in the introduction to the chapter, that my idea would be what is needed to save the world. In principle it doesn't demand that we emigrate to the South, we could also save the world by staying in the North. But it has many advantages to emigrate to the South, it's much better for the nature and for our grandchildren, nature can rewild in the North, and our grandchildren get a foretaste of paradise, my so called "paradisism". To live in forest gardens in the South, with warm winters and fellowship between many nations, is something I personally long for.

There should not be any law that says that everyone has to emigrate to the South, but maybe everyone would do it if they got a chance? Maybe the indigenous people of the North, the Sami people and the Eskimos would wait farthest, maybe until the next ice age?

If the climate in the South is unstable because of climate change, we can first emigrate to Central Europe, until the climate recovers. Emigration to the South must proceed slowly, over the course of several hundred years.

One can always discuss how long way back to the origins we should go (for example if one should emigrate to the South), but the very direction towards nature friendliness and the lifestyle of the wild indigenous people, I consider beyond reasonable doubt.

However, it's very unlikely that there will be an emigration to the South, it's just an unattainable pipe dream of mine.

(2) When the ecosystem has recovered enough, and humans have become few enough, they can slowly begin to fish more again, but I advise against hunting. As a radical pacifist** I suggest that hunting and fishing should only be done when it's absolutely necessary, when there is not enough food or clothes, to create as little suffering as possible. One should continue with forest gardening, and one should always prefer fishing before hunting, because smaller animals suffer less than bigger animals, especially when one hunts with primitive, merciful methods. Fishes don't risk becoming wounded when one fishes in a primitive way, with nets. To risk wounding a being is one of the reasons why one should not hunt an animal.

** My definition of radical pacifism: To refrain from all unnecessary violence, not to use violence unless it's absolutely necessary, yes one shouldn't even kill a mosquito if it's not absolutely necessary. However, one can never be totally free from violence, because even to eat plants is violence, because plants don't like to be killed, which one can conclude from the fact that certain plants have developed poisons and tags.

An immanent, natural spirituality

My atheism has certain contact points with pantheism; reality is God, nature is God, nothing supernatural, nothing above and beyond reality.

But I don't believe in the common pantheistic view that nature has a soul, a collective consciousness which governs it. I have never seen something like that.

But I resist the common idea that atheists cannot be spiritual. But here I distinguish between spirituality and religion.

My atheistic spirituality implies seeing all life as sacred. And I also believe here is the core of indigenous people's spirituality. The core of animism is that every thing and being in nature is sacred. That everything has a soul, that everything has a spirit, like animism believe, that can be boiled down to the fact that everything in nature is sacred.

Thus I believe we are in need of a "re-enchantment" of reality. The western world has lost the core of spirituality, that all life is sacred, that reality is God. This is the real cause behind industrialism, capitalism and consumerism. When one refrains from serving God, i.e. reality, one is led into those deep psychosis illnesses which are the true essence of civilization.

I believe in an immanent spirituality, where Mother Earth, Nature is the god we serve. We must convert to reality (instead of converting to religion), away both from religion and from the disenchantment which secularization has resulted in. We have

to become as radical in our immanent spirituality, in the fight for reality, as religious people are radical for their religion. We can't become too radical in this fight. Reality will namely overcome at last, and reward us for our fight.

The source of civilization and all psychosis is this; that we don't serve reality as our god, but have other gods, gods who stand above reality, which control and command reality. And we become like our gods. If reality is our god, then we become genuine, honest, real humans, who stand beside all animals and plants as their equals, yes even beside stones and mountains. If our god is something that stands above reality and manipulate, control, rule over and command reality, we also become humans with cavalier attitude, which manipulate, control, rule over, and command reality, nature. Then even our thoughts become above reality, beyond reality, which is my definition of psychosis. I have had many attacks of psychosis, so I can say something about them based upon my own experience. And this experience tells me that civilization is systemic psychosis.

God is wild

"C.S. Lewis says about God: "He is wild, you know!" And the one who wants to encounter the wild God, he himself has to get ready to become wild." (Richard Rohr, Franciscan priest in the Catholic Church)

What the advocates of civilization haven't thought about in their taming of everything they encounter, is that God, Mother Earth, Reality, is wild. God is not civilized. God is not Christian or religious. God doesn't let himself be domesticated. Reality itself is wild. Therefore the civilized project is a revolt against Reality itself. The civilized ones (myself included) are at odds with Reality itself. Maybe this is the source of all the mental problems in the civilized.

The civilized ones have forgotten that Mother Earth has not kept up with the so called "development", that she still remains in the Stone Age state. She is archaic, and cannot understand "the myth of progress". One cannot domesticate and destroy the wild nature without becoming at odds with Mother Earth, or with Reality itself. *"Nature bats last"* (Guy McPherson).

We must convert to God, convert to reality, away from all the lies and illusions of civilization about infinite growth and other such things, and return to the wild, free life, to the bosom of the wild god in nature.

The sadhus and the atheists of the west

Sadhus * in India sacrifice everything for Shiva or some other god, give away all their possessions for something that doesn't exist, while we atheistic westerners, who believe in nature and Mother Earth, i.e. reality, we sacrifice almost nothing for what we believe in. Shouldn't we be the ones who sacrifice most, as we sacrifice for things that really exists?

The non-religious are strangely paralysed regarding the sacrificing of themselves for the poor, for the animals and nature. One is branded as fanatic or lunatic if one makes too big sacrifices. One is freely allowed to be fanatic in sport, in war for

the homeland, or in business and technology without being criticized for it, but as soon as it comes to making big sacrifices for nature (for example through activism) one is branded as fanatic and "environmental extremist". Isn't that strange?

* The sadhus are the holy men of India, homeless, often half naked wandering, barefoot ascetics, who live on alms, and are some kind of wildmen.

The sterile, fascistic heaven fantasies of the civilized

I have noticed that when the civilized dream and hallucinate about heaven, they always fantasize about civilized heavens. Their heaven is a city, The New Jerusalem, with golden streets and pearly gates and mighty castles. I have been wondering about this. However, when I (also civilized indeed) fantasize about heaven, it's the wild nature I fantasize about; the sago forest. An ancient primeval forest in the tropics, full of LIFE! Full of animals, monkeys, fairies and trolls. Full of fruit trees and coconut trees. Where the moss is very thick!

I believe it is very important what kind of heaven we fantasize about, because this will influence what kind of heaven we are going to build here on earth. If we fantasize about the civilized wealth heaven, with golden streets and pearly gates, we will, here on earth, be trying to get rich, on the expense of the poor. If we fantasize about the sago forest, we will be trying to restore the forests on Mother Earth, thus healing the ecosystem.

I have to say it with emphasis, that the wealth heaven is immensely sterile and dead. It is the heaven of the fascists, where everything shall be controlled, and where nothing is allowed to be wild and free. It is also a hierarchical heaven, with God on the top and the most damned at the bottom. The sago forest has nothing of this, no division into heaven and hell. It's not sterile, but the climax of LIFE. It bubbles of life! There is room for all life in it, on equal terms. And it is a heaven which can be realized without anybody being stamped down on and oppressed, contrary to the wealth heaven, full oppression as it is. Those who fantasize about the latter, don't realise what sacrifices it demands. That it demands an eternal hell for the damned, at least according to Christian fundamentalists. It works exactly like the heaven of the rich ones here on earth: the heaven of the rich ones oppresses and impoverishes the third world and nature. The sago forest is not like this, and the sago forest is also an earthly paradise, which doesn't easily fit into the spirit world. Certainly one eats each other in the sago forest, but it is a democratic suffering – everyone has to die. Everyone must have their fair share of suffering. There is no eternal bliss here which requires that others are in eternal unbliss, as in the hierarchical, fascistic heaven. In the sago forest bliss and unbliss are quite equally distributed. This is the advantage with death being a part of it; it protects against fascism. I namely don't believe that the wild nature is fascistic. Life itself isn't evil. It is when one wants to go beyond life, to something else and "better", as civilization, as evil rises. I believe for example that the dream about the wealth heaven, more precisely the millennial kingdom, lay behind the evilness of the Nazis. Hitler was a catholic, and wanted to realise the millennial kingdom through the Third Reich.

I think we have to stop dreaming of eternal bliss, convert to reality and accept death and the democratic suffering that we all get our fair share of. And we have to realise that Life, the wild, free Life, isn't anything fascistic and evil that we have to flee from to find something "better". That we have to discipline and control. No, the wild Life is the best we have, and fascism consists rather in fighting this Life. We have to be grateful that death exists, because that prevents life from being fascistic. The real fascism lies namely in the idea of an eternal hell for the damned and eternal bliss for the saved *. Thank Nature I know that all suffering once ends.

* Indeed many theologians have tried to escape this fascism through suggesting that all gets saved and attain bliss at last, called universalism. But even eternal bliss without hell would in the end become boring, it's like watching an eternal football game.

Poop and pee are the gold of nature

It says something about the essence of civilization, that the civilized ones regard poop and pee as something disgusting, as waste, something one has to hide, be ashamed of and throw away. The truth is namely, that poop and pee are the gold of nature. Poop and pee ennobles the soil, makes it more nutritious, fertilizes it, give it life. Nothing in nature is as important as this; the refinement and ennoblement of the soil, in order that it can house more biodiversity. The poop and the pee (and the food waste) is actually the most important contribution to nature by us humans, through the ages, our true gift to her, something that make man not only **taking** from nature, but also **giving**. And yet man wants to throw away the poop and the pee (and the food waste) as waste, instead of giving it directly back to nature, as we did in the Stone Age *.

However, what the civilized regard as gold, the metal gold, it's the poop and pee of nature. The civilized gold, what the civilized ones are worshipping, has in fact no worth at all in the eyes of nature, it is in her eyes a hollow byproduct, as sterile and dead as the mountain, and it is also inside the mountains before the civilized ones dig it up. So upside-down is their worldview, so low they have sunk, that they worship the dead and barren, things like gold and money, and regard the poop and the pee, the life-giving, to be garbage and waste. The civilized ones are indeed necrophiliac, and their civilization regard it as a deed to destroy, kill and pollute nature to obtain some of the poop and the pee of nature: gold. Everything civilization creates, houses, cars, technology and machines, are stone dead things. Civilization hasn't simply a sense of life. Mother Earth, however, has life as the apple of her eye, her goal is to create as much and as rich Life as possible, and that's the reason why she loves poop and pee, however strange this may sound (the dogs, and many animals, by the way, also love it, and can sometimes eat poop).

* Such a practice would however require that the croplands become forests again, and that the world population would be one tenth as big as it is today.

What would you do if you had only seven years left to live?

What would you do if you knew that you had only seven years left to live?

If I had a work I didn't like, I would quit my job and do what I loved most: hanging a lot out with friends, write on my blog, read stuff that would prepare me for death and for the end of humanity, wander around in Sweden with friends, visit ecovillages (make pilgrimages there) and study permaculture, do a little guerilla gardening, live in my hut in the nature reserve Nackareservatet in Stockholm.

What would you do? Have you ever asked yourselves something like this any time?

There are in fact scientists who believe that humanity has only seven to thirteen years left to live, because of abrupt climate change. Among them are Malcolm Light and Guy McPherson.

"The evidence for human extinction by 2030 is overwhelming."

(Guy McPherson in an interview by Adam Engel)

I'm not sure they are right, but yet I try to imagine the world from their perspective. It's strange to observe that everything is changed with that new perspective. One makes other choices than one would make otherwise, if one has only seven years left to live. It's to live with death constantly in sight. One pays attention to things one would not pay attention to otherwise. Small, insignificant things can become important. It's easier to have the "silver glance", the "christ glance", which sees the true essence of everything. And as Guy McPherson says, no one says on his/her death bed "I should have bought more crap".

I also see it as a liberation if civilization would collapse and humanity would go extinct. It's a liberation for Mother Earth, who perhaps would be given a chance to recover if humanity goes extinct. The sooner, the better. Because I'm in fact afraid that humanity will be a cancer on Mother Earth that kills her completely, that the climate would become like that on Venus. Therefore I in fact hope that Malcolm Light and Guy McPherson are right, even if I'm not so sure about it. The planet and the third world have suffered so cruelly from civilization. I look forward to the end of humanity, but I will mourn bitterly over all other species who will go under with us. I would also mourn over the extinction of the indigenous people. But I put all my hope in that the planet, even if all complex life would go extinct, will begin to generate life again after a few million years. For this we have to fight.

Is death something evil?

"Whoever immerses in thoughts about the transience of life can be affected by death agony, but given that one doesn't suffer from immortality hubris it's most often possible to get over this very natural fact."

(David Jonstad in the book "Collapse. Life at the end of civilization" [in Swedish: Kollaps. Livet vid civilisationens slut], Ordfront 2012)

If one examines the relationships of physicians to death, how they sometimes try to prolong life at any cost, one would possibly reach the conclusion that physicians regard death as something evil. Likewise if you study the reactions of people to the death of their sick family member, one could possibly reach the conclusion that they regard death as something evil. But I shall now try to argue for the opposite position, that death doesn't need to be something evil, that one needs to fear.

Isn't the idea that my life ought to be prolonged at any cost, quite egoistic after all? Especially if my survival is at the expense of the poor and Mother Earth? And isn't the grief of people over the death of a sick family member, also quite egoistic? They don't think about the fact that the dead one now is at rest, liberated from his/her sufferings, immersed in the all. They just think; it is something evil that he/she is dead, because I suffer from it. They are maybe never thinking that now maybe the overpopulation problem becomes a little easier for Mother Earth to carry. Now can food that the dead one consumed while he/she still lived, go to someone who starve. Now the dead one has given room for other life, so that other life can blossom, or so that the life that still is alive, can be better off.

What is it about death that makes the civilized to regard it as something evil? What is so terrible about it? Isn't it something quite natural? Isn't it the condition for all life? If death is something evil, yes then the whole nature has to be evil, all reality be evil, because death is such a central part of reality. Think about how much death nature contains, how many animals and insects that die all the time, which have very short lives.

I believe the demonizing of death simply arises out of the fact that the civilized have alienated themselves from nature and the natural. This can be studied in how the civilized ones hide away death in hospitals, and how they hide away the corpses in graves instead of giving them as food to the animals in the forests and to the birds, as it was in the beginning of humanity. Death is synonymous with garbage for the civilized. They don't see that the corpses are fertilizers and food for nature, that death is needed so that other life can grow over the dead. The civilized regard death as contemptuously as they regard poop and pee, which has to be hidden away and treated like garbage, instead of letting it be included in the cycle of nature.

I believe that it is actually the lack of cyclical thinking that makes the civilized demonize death. They actually want to live eternally, in a static eternal bliss, instead of being a part of the mighty metamorphosis process of nature, where everything is born and dies and becomes fertilizer for other life. What is this wish other than alienation from nature and the natural?

From the civilized point of view death truly is something evil. But when one looks at it from a holistic, ecological thinking, then death can in fact be something good, and nothing to fear. To die is a good deed from the viewpoint of nature. We step aside in order that other life can blossom, not just our life. We have thus to die away from the ego if we want to stop fearing death. We have to die before death, as the old mystics expressed it. Death is to lose one's ego and be immersed in the totality. To become like a drop that is immersed in the sea. About this the so called "infinity-mysticism" has a lot to say (unlike "personality-mysticism". The terms are invented by Archbishop Nathan Söderblom). An example of such mysticism comes here,

from the book "The being of the eternal life" (In Swedish "Evighetslivets väsen", 1933) by Hans Wegmann:

"Romanticism is in the form it interests us, infinity-mysticism. Therefore Novalis also could, as one of its most pronounced advocates, exalt death as life's victory. Because for him it means salvation from the separatedness, return to totality."

Why do we then fear death? I believe it has, among other things, evolutionary causes. We are genetically conditioned to fear death in order to ensure the survival of our genes in children and grandchildren. We want to stay in the game and help these to carry our genes on. Isn't this why we fear death most during the able-bodied part of our life, and least when we grow old? Then we are full of days, and we have seen our children and grandchildren grow up and get by. I also believe that the ones who have children fear death more than the ones without children.

I also believe that we fear death because it is something unknown. But we have three mini-deaths that somehow mirror death, and give us a clue that makes it less unknown; falling asleep, orgasm and pooping/peeing. They all end pleasantly, so why wouldn't death end pleasantly? They're all about letting go. Wouldn't then death also be about that? And isn't it quite apparent that we in death return to Mother Earth, dissolve into Mother Earth, are immersed in the all? It's only if we believe in a continued personal existence after death that we need to be afraid. The return to Mother Earth gives us security. Mother Earth is a good god to be absorbed into. And if it might feel strange in the beginning, we will soon get used to not existing any more. As Mark Twain said: *"I do not fear death. I had been dead for billions and billions of years before I was born, and had not suffered the slightest inconvenience from it."*

The essence of psychosis

If one studies how the psychiatrists relate to the phenomenon of psychosis, how they lock up psychotic people in closed psychiatric departments, one has to reach the conclusion that psychosis is something evil, that must be fought with every possible means. But is this correct? I will now argue for that this is not correct in most cases, that psychosis is something that inevitably belong to life in general and characterizes it.

The first thing we have to ask ourselves is: what kind of "thing" is the psychosis? How shall we describe the psychosis in a few sentences? I will try the following definition: "psychosis is a being living in his/her fantasy world more than in the external world, when the being struggles with distinguishing reality from fantasy. The being projects his/her internal world on the external reality. And he/she is delusional." And then the following follow-up question arises: "Who doesn't do this sometimes? Don't we all live more or less in our fantasy world sometimes, projecting our internal world on the external? Isn't this especially characteristic for children? And yet we don't brand them as mentally ill! We let the children be with their fantasies. What gets us then to brand some as mentally ill and incarcerate them? I believe this often depends more on their breaking with the norm system of society than their being more psychotic than others. They are simply psychotic "in the wrong way". They upset certain taboos. Such a taboobreaking is for

example to say that one is Jesus, which I have personal experience of having done. But is this more destructive and psychotic than for example the fantasies of Hitler or Rudolf Höss about the evilness of the Jews and the inferiority of the Jewish race? Absolutely not, a lot less. But yet we brand the "messiah claimant" as mentally ill, while Hitler and Höss is often only considered as criminals, not mentally ill (Höss was hanged instead of being sent to compulsory forensic psychiatric treatment). There exist many similar examples. It is the breaking of taboos that decides who is considered mentally ill. I would also consider the collective madness called "civilization" as more psychotic as an individual, passing Jesus psychosis. And as very much more destructive. Because the one who has a Jesus psychosis, at least tries to be good, tries to save the environment and so on.

The destructivity of the collective psychosis lies partly in the fact that it is systematic, that it exists in the structures, and that it seldom ceases when it has grappled a human, in opposition to an individual psychosis, which almost always ceases. The collective sort of psychosis is what our politicians and church- and cultleaders suffer from. And this is really destructive psychosis, if there are anyone who ought to be incarcerated in mental hospitals it is our politicians and church- and cultleaders (I say it a little humorously, I don't really mean it). Because their babylonian rule of terror (from the viewpoint of the environment and the animals) destroy the very life conditions on earth, the very environment. And the psychiatrists also should be incarcerated, because their psychotic rule of terror is chaining people to the destructive civilization, nobody dares to leave civilization and return to nature from fear of being branded as mentally ill and sent to compulsory psychiatric treatment, the concentration camps of our time. No, everyone tries to be psychotic "in a proper way" to avoid this soul massacre and the zombifying medications, where the goal of the psychiatrists is to try to get the wildmen (who bubbles of life) to be as living dead as the civilized ones. Yes, even too wild children get to taste the reign of terror of the psychiatrists, even they are nowadays medicated with dangerous drugs (especially ADHD-children, which are medicated with amphetamine).

Psychosis shouldn't be medicated away, it belongs unavoidably to life. All life is pendling between intoxication and sobriety. I believe for example that monkeys and dogs, yes all animals, have their more "psychotic" phases. It is only the civilized ones who have been captured by the collective, petrified psychosis of the politicians and psychiatrists, which don't have so much of these ups and downs, their psychosis has stiffened into systems and structures that make them living dead, and gets them to fall upon and send to compulsory care everyone who break away from their psychosis and instead is captured by the natural individual psychoses which all children experience, all animals, yes all life except the civilized ones, "normal", common people. Psychosis belongs to the romanticism of life, life would be pretty dead without it.

Psychosis belongs to life, as I said, it is the intensifying into intoxication that produces the psychoses (it's therefore one easily becomes psychotic when one for example smokes cannabis). All infatuations, for example, are psychotic to some degree. But they are examples of sound, natural, individual psychoses. Often these are the only individual psychoses a "normal" human has. A wildman can have all sorts of psychoses, more or less taboo-breaking, but often not dangerous

at all. We have to stop demonizing and fearing the individual psychosis, because this makes us fear life itself, the wild reality, Mother Earth. That is what psychiatry is pursuing, with its fascist, sterile "soul hygiene" (Life isn't perfect, sterile, "scientifically correct", as the psychiatrists want to have it). The psychiatrists see themselves as some sort of "übermensch", which has direct contact with the ultimate "scientific", true reality, elevated above all psychoses, able to determine what is psychotic and what is not. It seems that everything wild is psychotic to them. If they would rule India, for example, they would likely incarcerate all sadhus into mental hospitals. It's therefore we don't have any sadhus in the west, no equivalent to the sadhu-institution. Instead we have the homeless and the "mentally ill", mentally broken from the hard treatment of society and psychiatry. It is my firm conviction that most of the psychotic people who end up in locked department should not have ended up there, but they should have been met with patience and forbearance with something that is passing, which would have happened in an indigenous tribe in the jungle. Instead psychiatry often makes their psychoses even worse, so that it often ends up in despair, depression and suicidal thoughts (so it has been for me). And it is easy to end up in paranoia when one gets such a cruel treatment (especially the medication is often horrible in the beginning), yet it is a form of completely sound and natural psychosis, a sound reaction to a mad world, which is what most of the psychoses are. *"It's not you who are mad, it's the world which is sick"*, the Swedish reggae-star Kapten Röd sings.

The churches of Sweden – disgraces for the country

When one begins to see behind the scenes what lies behind the churches of Sweden, especially in their history, they appear as pure disgraces for the country. Just think, the churches are built to the glory of cosmic dictators (who indeed don't exist) – Jesus and God. And just think, they are built on the expense of the poor and the environment. One can look at them as monuments or gravestones over all the poor in the world who has starved or died of starvation, and all nature that has perished, because the money and the work force has gone into building churches instead of feeding the poor and protecting nature. The Christendom of Sweden should have acknowledged this, and tried to pay back its debt to the poor and nature, through remaking the churches from service buildings to refugee camps and overnight places for the homeless, and plant forest gardens and forests on the available ground that the churches own. But no repentance is to find in the Christendom of Sweden as it is today, only the same "rich man – oppression" as always, through the "christian right" in politics. The christendom of Sweden has nothing left of the original revolutionary spirit of christianity, the one which resided in the savage John the Baptist and in the wild animal Jesus Christ, the disciple of John the Baptist, who, even if he is a mythical figure, is something of an archetype for the anarchistic revolutionary and rebel who is tortured and executed for his revolt.

The churches are, however, only prime examples of the rottenness of the whole civilization; all buildings, all industries, all monuments, and almost all art and culture are thefts from the poor, especially the third world and nature. And now – through Peak Oil and climate change – nature begins to demand that humanity pays back its sky-high debt.

What would the government of Sweden say if we had monuments of Hitler or Stalin everywhere in our country? But just this the churches are – monuments of a cosmic Hitler, a cosmic Stalin – the tyrant god of most of the Christians (if you don't believe me, read the Old Testament, and see for yourself what kind of god it portrays).

Lewis Mumford about the Eichmanns of our time

"In every country there are today countless Eichmanns (one of the leaders of Nazi Germany, my remark) in administrative offices, in business corporations, in universities, in laboratories, in the armed forces, orderly obedient persons ready to carry out any officially sanctioned fantasy project, however dehumanized and debased."

(Lewis Mumford in the book *"Myth of the Machine. Technics and Human development"*. Harvest books 1971)

Civilization as the inner essence of fascism

"Arbeit macht frei" (German for "work liberates") one could read above the entrance to the concentration camp in Auschwitz. Many civilized ones (especially the religious fundamentalists), still believe a little in this, even though they wouldn't admit it. It's called nowadays "the work strategy" (*"arbetslinjen"*), with a little finer word. We look at work **as an end in itself**, an ideal to strive for, something that is more noble than not to work, something that ennobles us and liberates us, something that makes us sure about our chosenness and our value (this is especially pointed out by Max Weber in his classic work in sociology of religion "The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism" from 1905). **But we didn't work, a long way back in our primeval history**, we picked fruits and nuts from the trees in the forest we walked naked in, as the monkeys, before we began to hunt animals, i.e. the first seed of work. And the hunting and gathering work of the Stone Age might not even be called real work, because we didn't distinguish between work and leisure time at that time. It was first with the rise of agriculture that we really began to work, with the rise of division of labour. But even the peasants in old times often didn't distinguish between work and leisure time.

Nazism was no isolated phenomenon in history, it didn't rise in a vacuum, as many apparently believe (and therefore are blind to their own fascism). It builds on all of civilization previously in place, and has actually never disappeared, only arisen again and again in new forms. Civilization as a whole has always been Nazi/fascist, it builds on colonialism and cruel conquest of countries, humans and environment, on despotism (both dictatorial and democratic such), nepotism, on slavery (both in its old and in its modern more systematic form of wage bondage), on xenophobia, on sexism and patriarchy, on domestication (taming and enslavement) of plants and animals, on rationalization and technologisation of everything, on extermination of everything wild and so on. All this sort of lies in the essence of civilization, so that the more civilized and developed a society is, the more it tends to have these features. We maybe think that the more civilized one is, the more tolerant and less destructive one is, but then one forgets to look at the

downside of this civilizing process, which is things like impoverishment of the environment and the exploitation of cheap labour force in the third world, the development of terrible, shameful, gigantic animal factories, yes heading for a total ecocatastrophe through the emissions leading to climate change. This is the downside of the civilized "tolerance", which often only applies to the relatively rich white westerners, while factory workers in the third world live in nothing but slave-like conditions, forced into it because of economic colonialism – they are simply forced into drudging in these factories because civilization has destroyed their possibilities of self-sufficiency. And this should be sort of "tolerance" and "civilizing of the savages". I get so angry that I could roar.

My point is that history has not advanced, and humanity has not gotten better when one sees the bigger picture, fascism hasn't disappeared (Sweden is a police state), it's just directed at others than the relatively rich westerners, beings like the animals and the environment. The relatively rich have always been privileged, throughout the civilized history, it's nothing new. What is new is, however, the effort of exterminating everything wild, all wild nature, the effort of "civilizing" all savages, the radical rationalization of all life, so that everything shall become mechanical and technological – and **this is the inner essence of fascism**. And what is also new is the threat against the very survival of earth that civilization has become, because of climate change. The Jews of the time of Hitler has changed into non-human species and Mother Earth, which we exterminate at an accelerated rate. And instead of dismantling the death machinery, our politicians just race ahead, making the death machinery just bigger. **If something is fascism, it is this**; to live in such a way that one's lifestyle and one's choices in the end transform the whole civilization and Mother Earth to a single big concentration camp.

And we ordinary people wash our hands and play innocent! We blame the politicians! But we are all more or less guilty of this mess we have ended up in, and we do better to admit the fascism in our dealings. When man is caught in the act of "ecocide", and awakens to what he/she has done, it requires an incredible courage to admit one's fascism. There you have the cause of all lame climate negotiations and all confidence in that technology shall save us: we are afraid of admitting the fascism that is built into our civilization, and which demands of us that we dismantle civilization, dismantle fascism, not intensifying it into a last desperate outburst of technofascism, as the desperate war of Hitler against Soviet can be a weak model of.

How the hell of civilization gets reproduced

There is a story from the priest Richard Wurmbrand from his time in the prison in Romania during the reign of Ceaucescu, that the prison guards forced a prisoner to eat poop, and the prisoner got crazy from this and asked for more. This I think captures well how the expansion of civilisation goes. Take for example mathematics, the science of death, little but "poop". We were forced in the elementary school to study mathematics, and those who got crazy from the numbers asked for more, and studied "deliberately" long mathematics in high school and mathematical sciences in university. They are simply brainwashed to "like" mathematics. How can anybody like something so mechanical and dead as numbers and

mathematics? There is no life in it, nothing wild, no revolutionary spirit, nothing human, only the transformation of life to mechanics and roboticness.

The Christians have in all times learned to thank God for everything, even for catastrophes. They are sort of sent by God to discipline us and educate us, so that we are chastened through the suffering. This thanking for the torture of a god tyrant reminds of the prisoner who wanted more poop, and exhibit similar psychopathology. When one has been enough plagued and humiliated, one becomes sometimes somehow one with one's tormentor, he moves into one's chest. This is how "codependency" (as, among others, Tommy Hellsten has written about) arises in children of destructive alcoholic parents or parents with religious fundamentalism. I know about a child who thanked her (Christian fundamentalist) father after he had spanked her with the rod when she was a child. And now she herself spank her children (or rather her husband does it with her permission). The oppression goes on, the victims sometimes become perpetrators because of the codependency and the incorporating of the tyrant in oneself. This is how the hell of civilization goes on and is reproduced.

What of civilization I think one should begin to dismantle. And which "industries" one should encourage.

One should begin with dismantling the war- and the nuclear power industry. And the next industries one should begin to dismantle, after war industry and the nuclear power industry, about in priority order, the worst first (I think that all these industries are completely unnecessary, yes most of them are even damaging):

Airline industry, car industry (everything except electrical busses), oil industry (80 % away), coal industry (80 % away), natural gas industry (80 % away), palm oil industry, forest industry (most of it should be dismantled, the rest only for firewood), paper industry (everything but paper to certain chosen books and newspaper messages), animal factory industry (especially fur industry), asphalt paving industry, building industry (everything but renovation), drug industry, tobacco industry, alcohol industry, prostitution industry, mining industry (everything but metals for wind power and solar power), firework-industry, film industry (everything but small scale "art "films), sport industry, tourist industry, advertisement industry, boat building industry (everything but sail ships, row boats and canoes), entertainment industry, robot industry, finance and bank industry, money printing industry, hunting industry, candy industry, cake- and pastryindustry, electronics industry (everything but components to computers, which are mostly obtained through recycling), computer industry (everything but renovation of existing computers), computer game industry, mobile phone industry, porn industry, coffee industry, tea industry, toy industry, chocolate industry, cotton industry,"school industry" (elementary school as compulsory school attendance is skipped, likewise all vocational school educations which educate for harmful and unnecessary professions, high school and the universities are allowed, especially disciplines like medicin, climate science, ecology, human ecology and conservation biology), metal industry (everything but certain metals to wind power and solar power), weekly magazine industry, newspaper industry (most away),

icecream industry, sugar industry, slot machine industry, pub, bar and café industry (the places are needed as homes for refugees), cloth industry (most away, woolclothes would be encouraged), make-up industry, lotteryindustry, publishing industry (most away).

Do you come up with other villains and non-essentials?

The "industries" one should encourage, would, in priority order, be: "tree planting industry", "nursery garden industry" (especially fruit and nut trees), hospital industry, pharmaceutical industry (mostly pain killers, ataractic drugs, sleeping pills etc.), charity industry (in a non-colonialistic spirit, like aid organizations), dentist industry, elderly care, sleeping bag industry, "mosquito net industry", "wool cloth industry", "permaculture industry", "gardening industry", "teepee and yurt industry", "tentmaker industry", "tent stove industry", bicycle industry, recycling industry, "second hand shop industry", "library industry", "post industry" "agriculture industry" (organic farming, without animal factories), fishing industry (however, a much milder, small scale fishing, 80 % away), knitting industry (mostly wool), wind power industry (small scale), solar panel industry (small scale), etc.

These are among the "industries" I feel still serve Life.

Did animalism arise too late?

I wonder if animalism with its vision about the dismantling of civilization arose too late. Won't climate change catch up with us, and mess up all efforts of humanity to return to the wild?

If it's true what the environment professor Guy McPherson says, that humanity will die out before 2030, then we won't be able to go back to the wild. I guess it takes at least hundred years if one shall dismantle civilization in a humane way, without using coercion and violence. And this I don't want, as a radical pacifist.

But there is a considerable chance that McPherson is wrong, and that we have a lot more time. Therefore we should not give up hope.

However, even if we would plant forests wherever there are cropfields now, it would not bind enough carbon dioxide to prevent runaway global warming. We should have begun this already 1916.

The Indian Christian evangelist and sadhu **Sadhu Sundar Singh** (1889-1929), whom I admire much, should have preached animalism.

Will animalism be a despairing, desperate dream about the impossible?

Civilized art and culture: a TV in the prisoner's cell

Civilized art and culture is like a TV in the prisoner's cell. Internet also, for that matter. On the screen we see everything we want to take part in, but do not dare to, because of the tyranny of civilization. So we choose to look at the screen instead of living out like the wild animals do. In art and in culture all our longing is concentrated. But " *Only the tame birds have a longing. The wild ones fly*", said the Finno-Swedish poet Elmer Diktonius.

We read the Pippi-books and Emil-books of Astrid Lindgren about all the pranks we didn't dare to do as children, and neither dare to do as adults. We read exciting adventure novels about everything we would like to take part in, but don't dare to, because it's not safe "out there", and because we don't dare to leave our safe life with apartment and work. We consign our longing for our animal origins to novel archetypes like Tarzan and Mowgli. We romanticize forest freedom heroes like Robin Hood. We romanticize the Indians in Indian novels. We idealize them because we so long for what we lost when civilization arose.

We consign representants for the wild animals to zoos, where they become like a TV-screen which shows us the jungle, forest and their animals, our lost paradise. And if we think they are our prisoners, which we seldom do, we don't see that it's we who are the real prisoners, not the animals in the zoo. They are the TV-screen in the prisoner's cell, signs of our lost paradise, which we actually long for. Yes, we actually long for all these animals in zoo being wild together with us in the forest and jungle, but because we have imprisoned ourselves in civilization, we do not want (outwardly) anything else than having these animals in zoos to remind us of our origin, be like a TV-screen in the prisoner's room. We need a TV in the prison cell, to entertain ourselves. We are the actual prisoners, because we do not dare to live out our animal nature although we are "free" outwardly, while the animals in the zoo does this to a certain degree even though they are prisoners outwardly. It is the inward freedom that counts, and in the inward the civilized ones are prisoners who watch a TV-screen in their cell. Only prisoners need entertainment. Only prisoners need to kill time with entertainment.

I see this, and still I go on staring at the TV-screen (in the aforementioned symbolic sense). What else shall I do? We are thrown out from our primeval paradise, the jungle and the forest. Only there, in a tribe of a couple of dozen people, strolling around eating fruits and nuts, as the monkeys, would the need for the TV-screen be destroyed. But the hole after the ejection have to be filled by something. Civilization is the TV-screen that should fill the hole after man's ejection of himself out of paradise. So simple it is. But it can never fill the hole, just as a drug can't do that. We can't fool ourselves into thinking that the TV-screen can fill the hole after the jungle and the forest. We can't fool ourselves into believing that the TV-screen is reality. We're living boring lives, that's the truth. That's why we need the TV-screen, which gives us the impression that something is happening. But in reality civilization has eradicated all the wild from its domains, so that what we have left is the liturgical chanting of the politicians and priests about the same psychotic and meaningless things year in and year out, and our own boring drudgery in their leash.

The horror of the zoos

"The animals of the world exist for their own reasons. They were not made for humans any more than black people were made for white, or women created for men". (Alice Walker)

Zoos alone would be enough for me in order that I would see through the horrific rottenness of civilization and it would get me to wish for its perdition. But there are quite many other reasons for this, too. With regard to the zoos it's quite strange that someone can defend civilization. Zoos is something so grotesque that I could go into a fit of rage.

There is a story about a grizzly bear who went mad in a zoo. I feel a certain affinity. I have also gone mad from civilization.

Isn't all the good in civilization only make-up on its terribly ugly face? Most of all art and culture? Aren't they things which makes us tolerate the horrors, instead of revolting?

Something about the fascism of our time: the police and the military

The police and the military is the most Fascist-like things we have in Sweden. They are trained to blind obedience, and would without hesitation obey orders from a fascistic government (in most cases). Nazism was possible much because police and military in Germany blindly obeyed orders, no matter what the orders were. A society which encourage blind obedience and underestimate critical thinking is already partly fascistic, which the Swedish society already is, which most clearly appears in the military. And to the same extent society is militarized, to the same extent the police state emerges, to the same extent a society is Fascist.

Everything is adjusted for the catastrophe

Everything is adjusted in order that humanity will go off the cliff. The shopping centres are full of escalators. The roads are paved with asphalt. Those who obey the system are rewarded. Those who don't, are punished. It's illegal to live in small huts in the forest, one breaks the Right of Public Access. Those who have least ecological footprint, the homeless, have a difficult existence. Those with greatest ecological footprint, the CEOs of the oil companies (and the Saudi Arabian princes), live in luxury, are rewarded immensely by the system.

We live in a mad world. Much is upside-down.

But maybe humanity comes to its senses when the climate change becomes all too obvious? But then it's likely too late to do something to save humanity. I believe that it is already now too late to save humanity from going extinct within a near future (in hundred years or so). We have to prepare ourselves for the unavoidable, and do whatever we can to save other species than man from destruction. Methane gas from the Arctic has probably bypassed carbon dioxide as the phenomenon that primarily drives climate change.

Money should be abolished

Money (both cash and electronic money) should be abolished. Then only the necessary and useful things would be done, if everyone would work as volunteers. And greed would collapse. Most of what is done today is totally useless and unnecessary, and would never be done were it not for the desire for more money, greed, which inundates all regards for humans and environment.

The hubris of civilization

"We have been living like gods. Our task now is to learn how to live like humans. Our descent will not be easy."

(Randy Udall, 2013)

Has it ever struck you, when you have watched an incredibly advanced modern movie, with incredibly complicated animations, that civilization suffers from hubris?

The film industry goes into incredibly complicated, difficult and expensive achievements just to give us a couple of hours of entertainment, and so that the creators of the movies can be seen and honored.

Doesn't civilization begin to remind of the tower of Babel, which was brought down by God because people tried to reach the sky?

This feature of hubris isn't just visible in the film industry, but also in all the industries of civilization. Everywhere people strive for achievements which reach the sky, just to nurture the rich part of the world population, and people often don't give a damn about the environment, the poor and the third world.

For the ancient Greeks in antiquity hubris meant that one tried to challenge the gods, breaching the limits for one's place in existence. Hasn't humanity now breached these limits quite by far, when even the climate begins to react strongly?

For the ancient Greeks hubris was always followed by nemesis. Nemesis was the punishment of the gods for hubris. We modern humans won't be punished by any god, however by Mother Earth, which can be considered as some type of god, if you like. And Mother Earth doesn't punish us in any real sense, she just gets destroyed and sick, gets fever, so that we die when our resources and our surroundings don't nourish us anymore because they are exhausted and destroyed (by the combination of Peak Oil and climate change)

The total lack of wildmen/wildwomen in the western world

I recently googled "Wildman" on the internet, and I found almost nothing of interest to read. Is internet completely dead? Is there nothing wild there? The thing surely is that there are no genuine wildmen/wildwomen in the west. Asia has still preserved something of the wildman tradition, the sadhus and faqirs in India are examples of eastern people who reminds a

little of what I'm thinking of. But we have no such tradition in the west.

Is it because of the psychiatry's reign of terror that everything wild has been abolished from the west? I believe so. Everything wild has been exterminated from western civilization, and consigned to the animal kingdom (above which we think we stand), and the third world. The little wild which is left, one can find at closed psychiatric departments. These are the human zoos where "experts" can study human wildness, the little that is left. The western humanity has died spiritually, and it did that long ago. The lack of wildmen/wildwomen is a symptom of this. The closest one gets is homeless people, drug addicts, drunkards, hippies and anarchists, but none of these are true wildmen/wildwomen, all adjust themselves to civilization in order to avoid incarceration. They all go into finished roles, and fulfil these perfectly. But there are no accepted roles for wildmen/wildwomen in the western world. If you break a little free, and if you are a little animalistic and wild, the police, security guys and psychiatry soon catch you. I have experience of this, because I believe namely that I have been something as rare as a genuine wildman. Hardly anymore, because of psychiatry, who has stolen from me my last wildness. And now I just hope that the hell of civilization will stop through Peak Oil and climate change, that civilization will collapse *, so deeply I hate the machinery which stole from me my last wildness. Now I'm just wild in thoughts, in dreams, not in body. I'm a virtual wildman. There are many such people, for example Guy McPherson, whom I highly value. Who long incredibly strongly for justice to be administered, and for civilization getting what it deserves – total collapse. Yes, can one be a wildman without longing for this? Those who don't have this longing, those are people who have been tamed by civilization so totally that they don't see the bars of their own cage. I think this longing lies behind many of my psychoses, which aren't at all unintelligible when one looks at them from this viewpoint. Yes, they appear to me even a little logical when one thinks like a wildman/wildwoman. I have during my psychoses prayed and hoped for God/Nature to intervene and stop civilization (for example by me writing doomsday dates on church walls). I still pray, somehow, but now as an atheist. And now I don't pray to god, but to humans so they can settle with and abandon civilization, in order to save the climate.

* It would indeed be good for nature if civilization collapsed, but far better would be a controlled dismantling of civilization, it would also be better for humans, not only better for nature. As regards to nature, deforestation takes off in a collapse, when everyone will burn firewood to warm the house instead of using electricity. And animal hunting also takes off, so that we risk driving animal species to extinction.

Why I believe that the core of animalism is true. And something about how animalism arose.

I sometimes ransack myself and question if I'm on the wrong track in regard to animalism, if it is perhaps flawed. But I can't get away from thinking that the core of it is true; man is an animal among other animals (doesn't stand above the other animals), and should live in harmony with herself/himself, live like an animal. How can anybody deny this? Do you agree, my

reader? But to my parents this sucks (and also to many other religious people). Yes, they are ashamed of their animal nature, then it's not so strange that they react like this. They are ashamed of most of what directly reminds them of being animals; pooping and peeing, farting, sex and so on. But how stupid isn't it to be ashamed of being an animal! One has then entered into conflict with reality itself, one wants to hide and conceal reality, one actually wants to kill reality. Religion is often a big enemy of life.

Is it so terrible to be an animal? Are animals really so terrible?

But there are those who suggest that evolution of man is natural: we haven't stopped being animals just because we are civilized, civilization is natural for the animalism of man, it is the feature of the animal man. Ants build anthills, and man builds civilization.

It is difficult to argue against this reasoning, which usual exists among civilization believing atheists. How shall I tackle this?

I tackle this through looking into myself, and feeling. How did animalism arise? Yes, through letting go of my inhibitions, my blocks, my shame, and becoming thoroughly honest, I let go of the civilized veneer and the hypocrisy that we all know so well. What then arised in my head was animalism. That the civilized project is utterly confused. That we, when we let go of the "deliberate" wage bondage, we return to nature, to the forest and to the lifestyle of the animals, this is what arises unconstrainedly when we let go of our inhibitions. Not criminality. That's not natural. **The lifestyle of the animals** is natural. And civilization has gotten quite far away from the lifestyle of the animals. Just study a typical wage slave (there are exceptions!), and you will see how he/she oppresses his/her animal nature in order to adjust to civilization. He/she seldom admits that the work is distasteful, but one notices it in how he/she longs for the end of the work day, and how he/she forces himself/herself to get up in the morning, and then goes a little reluctantly to work. No animal does anything like that. Not even the ants, which should be the animal archetype of diligence. The animals live directly, according to the instincts. We have no "job instinct" which tells us we should work in the specialized professions of society. Our instincts were born and evolved in the peace of the jungle, where we wandered naked and fed on fruits and nuts directly from the trees. We didn't work then, and all work has just lead us further and further away from our original animal nature. Already hunting with more advanced hunting tools (so we could kill) was a departure from our animal nature. It doesn't lie in our instincts to kill other mammals. You just have to try, and you will see. We are almost fully vegetarians and insectivores by nature, as the gorillas. We have no fangs. And it is the manipulation of fire and salt which has made us like meat and fish. In raw form we don't think they taste so well.

But it isn't just our instincts which tell us that civilization is against our animal nature – even the effects of civilization tell us this; aren't we in the process of destroying our planet? Civilization isn't natural, it's cancerous. It is a sickness, speaking with the anarchoprimitivist philosopher Edward Carpenter (1844-1929). And indeed some sicknesses can be natural, nothing is in a way unnatural, but I still want to insist that civilization is an enemy of life and fights against our nature as animals. And if we have a set of faults which no other animals have, and we feel uncomfortable with these faults and they are

about to destroy our planet, couldn't one then call them unnatural? Is a bulldozer natural? One really has to strain one's fantasy to be able to call it natural, if we shall keep something of what the word natural has stood for since times immemorial. Already Freud spoke about "The uneasiness in culture" ("Das Unbehagen in der Kultur"). Are there any animals who have created for themselves a society with which they are uncomfortable? I don't think so. Work is not natural among animals, least of all a far-reaching division of labour, specialization in work. It makes us bored. We often do the same things over and over again. Our work just takes us further and further away from our instincts the more specialized it is. It becomes just a bigger and bigger distance between what we do and our survival instinct, which should dictate what we should do, if we got to choose ourselves – pursue things which has to do with our basic needs, not to polish on the sick wealth of some rich man, as most of us do. It can't be natural!

The belief in the saving power of technology. And something about the movie Avatar.

The environmental movement has often the strange property that it believes in the saving power of technology, that technology has the power to save us from its own consequences. This belief one sees for example in Greenpeace. Despite this they do a lot of good things. If only they hadn't been such great believers in technology, they would be excellent. Now they behave like a fishing boat which is about to fish, while it states with great letters on the boat: "Stop the over-fishing of the seas!" Greenpeace seems not to understand that more technology means more emissions, and that a lot of slavery is imbedded in their ipods and smartphones, nonetheless it's often a question of cheap labour force from the third world.

If the world would follow the advice of Greenpeace, it would collapse (for example if it would follow that advise about letting the rest of the coal be in the ground), and then it would be the end with Greenpeace in its present form, because Greenpeace uses a lot of expensive technology to spread its message and to carry out its actions and campaigns.

The movie Avatar has got the same problem. It shows a biting critique of civilization, which is in fact anarchoprimitivistic in its strength, but hardly realises that it preaches its own extermination, the extermination of the film industry. Because isn't the film industry a part of the colonial project in the western world, a part of the exploitation of nature and the third world? From where does the technology that the film industry uses, come?, one can ask oneself. And if we want to use Avatar as a reference point, isn't the following what the film industry does, that it is present on the planet Pandora and is filming the trespass of the military upon the planet, just to sell it to the military so that it can have a few hours of distraction in front of the TV? Isn't that what the film industry is actually about? To exploit the fight between good and evil, so that we can get our distraction hours in front of the TV *? I believe that few who have watched Avatar really, after they have seen the film, seriously decide to unite with the fight of many indigenous people to dismantle civilization. No, we got our two hours of distraction, and then we go on as before, imagining that we somehow stand on the good side in the battle. Maybe we also invest a little in "environmentally friendly" technology (an

electric car, for example), but deeper than this it seldom goes. We are helpless prisoners of civilization.

I would like to, as Jake Sully in the Avatar-movie, try to stop those bulldozers and machines which are about to exterminate our environment. I would like to, as him, shout and flap the arms in front of the machines, and shout "What the hell are you up to, you damn idiots!", and maybe I also would like to destroy the machines, but I do not dare to. I'm too cowardly, and I don't want to get imprisoned. There is a deep discrepancy between what I know and what I do, that I suffer under. Only that I am so much on the internet is a part of this discrepancy.

* And those who film the incursion of the military on Pandora, does it with technology that is built on the enslavement of the indigenous people of Pandora, and exploitation of its nature.

Our schools have missed the most important in education

Our elementary schools have missed the most important in education; to teach the pupils about anarchism, anarcho-primitivism, gardening, permaculture, survivalism and self-sufficiency knowledge. Besides, the elementary school teaches all too little about climate change and nothing about Peak Oil. Instead they teach a lot of unnecessary things, which the pupils soon forget, and most of these they will not have any use for during the rest of their life. With its coercive being, school doesn't encourage self-study, but gets one to associate knowledge with something heavy, with demands, homeworks and tests. Is this the reason why the education level among ordinary people is so low (not to mention the education of the heart)? The elementary school system has failed thoroughly, and compulsory school attendance should be dismantled, and replaced with deliberate studies by the children. And parents, friends and library should, to a great extent, take over school as general educators, so that the education becomes small scale and organic, fitting with the vision about living as the indigenous people. **Compulsory school attendance is only one of the aspects of colonialism**; the wild shall be civilized, children shall be civilized and become cogs in the machinery of civilization. What civilization has done against the blacks, the indigenous people of America and the third world it does against the children, and this without being criticized by the cultural elites (they actually accept this!) This soul slaughter is allowed to go on without anybody saying a squeak. Damn it! I know from own experience how heavy it was to study at elementary school. The two first years were easy enough, but then it got worse and worse, and at the end I counted the days until it would end, in the ninth grade.

It is much the fault of the schools that civilization is not dismantled: it is there humans are brainwashed into the cult "civilization". If the general education would be free, then people soon would learn to criticize and see through civilization and see its downside. The teachers don't see this, they believe they teach the children to think critically. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the teachers make their living from the fact that they don't teach people to think critically; if they had done this, it had been the suicide of the education system, because then we had dismantled the school system and

introduced the oldfashioned apprentice system, a really wise system for passing on knowledge – in this system the schools are not needed, and we did well with this throughout history up to the Middle Ages, and it is still in use in many professions. Then it's another thing, for sure, that most professions are not needed. But in the few professions which are useful, as the medical profession and the farmer profession (ecological, small scale farming), the apprentice system should altogether replace the schools. Then we would avoid the nasty compulsory school attendance, which only plagues the children. Do you remember how horrible the tests were?

The apprentice system is not heavy, because there the knowledge is **organically transmitted**, like how we got knowledge through asking our parents when we were children, or how we got historical knowledge through reading "The three Musketeers" by Alexandre Dumas. This could be called "animalistic education", or "the rewilding of education".

It is instructive to study how the authorities of the North America treated the indigenous people's children, how they took them from their parents and forced them into boarding schools, to civilize them. In this the essence of the school is revealed, which is colonialism. The indigenous children in the boarding schools weren't even allowed to speak their own language in the school. Their culture and their language had to be eradicated. This is so sickening that one could spew up. This is enough for making one wish for civilizational collapse.

However, I'm not against school when it's deliberate, and has nothing of coercion, like high schools and universities*. But even they should be dismantled, when we go back to the lifestyle of the indigenous people. There we can go on educating ourselves, but it won't happen through a school system, but it will be the master teaching his disciples in the tribe/town, as it has been since ancient times. An organic, natural education.

It has its disadvantages to dismantle civilization, a lot of knowledge will gradually be lost, but one doesn't need to become superstitious just because one lives as the indigenous people, for example there is an indigenous tribe in Amazonas – the Piraha people – which are some kind of atheists.

* I'm thus only against compulsory school attendance. It should be deliberate and pleasure-filled to go to school. The school in the third world should also be disconnected from the colonial project.

The rich world has lost the most important; community

"Our lack of community is intensely painful. A TV talk show is not a community. A couple of hours in a church per each Sabbath is not community. A multinational corporation is neither a human nor a community, and in the sweatshops, defiled agribusiness fields, genetic mutation labs, ecological dead zones, the inhumanity is showing."

(David James Duncan, b. 1952, novelist and essayist)

How stupid man is, who is building big houses and tower blocks, wearing himself out to build grand constructions, when

one could live in small teepee villages, which demands minimal work to set up! And as a result of the big buildings the relationships between the neighbours get impersonal and cold, they lose the most important; community*. This we owned when we still lived in cot-, hut- and teepee villages thousands of years ago. The community-spirit doesn't thrive in the big and grandiose, it must be small scale in order to be thriving. It thrives in humility and the unity with the barrenness and small-scale approach of nature.

I believe that community, like love, belongs to the most important things in life, and has to be prioritized accordingly. Everything has to be planned so that community can arise. But in the rich part of the world we have sold our community, sacrificed it on the altar of the market and of capitalism. Our reward has been that one doesn't even know one's neighbours, mostly. Talk about spiritual death.

The ecovillages are a reaction against this. There one finds initial steps to a restoration of the old community-spirit. There the seeds of the new humanity are sown. But the ecovillages are miserably few. All ranches and farms should be ecovillages.

The city has no community. The city is an ecocatastrophy and the centre of the spiritual death, where the pursuit of power, status and grandiosity has made true cooperation and community impossible. The city is the centre of competition. One competes in everything, even in things like poetry (think poetry slam), even in holy things. One poisons everything with competition. The true life is not in competition, but in cooperation and community. It is cooperation that makes us evolutionarily viable, not competition. The fact that it has to compete in everything has made civilization doomed, because one becomes blind and deaf for the holiness of life when one only competes all the time.

* I think here of basal community, neighbour community in everyday life. All associations and clubs in the world cannot compensate for this.

One doesn't compromise with fascists

Sometimes it is good to compromise, I admit. Without compromises everything would be chaos. But one shouldn't compromise on anything whatsoever. It is here I mean that the politicians are way off track with their endless "diplomacy". One doesn't compromise on the survival of the planet, about the climate threat. One doesn't compromise with those who are about to destroy nature.

Would the politicians compromise with neo-nazis if they sat in the parliament and constituted a considerable part of the government? I don't think so.

Many politicians are not far from fascism. To compromise with them means to sell one's soul, to sell the wellbeing of the planet in order to not lose one's career.

One should not practice diplomacy with fascists, and neither with people who want to sacrifice nature on the altar of

capitalism. Such ones one should take a clear stand against. And that's what I do here. I take a clear stand against such politics in which fascists can thrive and grow, as the Sweden-Democrats (Sverigedemokraterna) has done. The whole Swedish parliament is morally bankrupt. They support the rich, support fascists, support nature destroyers. The only wise policies are the ones which advocate degrowth and dismantling of civilization, and that could in my opinion happen through a world parliament constituted by a reformed UN, an agency which takes climate change seriously, the most important threat against the planet we have. Our Swedish government appears however to live in a denial of the climate threat, at least in practice. They don't see how serious it is, that it threatens the very survival of the planet, and that we therefore have to dismantle civilization as fast as possible.

The inherent mercy of animalism and anarcho-primitivism

A big part of my life has been about looking for mercy. First it was the search for a merciful God, then it turned more and more into a search for a merciful society, a merciful humanity. I saw that there was something terribly merciless with the present order. It is tyrannic. It is a slave driver, which flogs us to slavery and obedience. If you don't work, you don't get any money, and then you have to live as a beggar and homeless (this is especially true in the third world).

I became homeless to avoid the whip above me, to be able to do what I loved. And it turned out to be a way which led to my liberation and development as a human, even though it went through many psychoses. But at last I have managed to liberate myself from religion, and from the tyrannic society, and create a merciful sphere around me, to be merciful towards myself and others.

What developed inside me during all this, was what I have called anarchoprimitivism and animalism, a merciful lifestyle, merciful against myself, merciful against others, merciful against nature and animals. I don't demand of myself that I shall work eight hour days with things I don't like so much, wear out myself day after day. And I don't demand it from anyone else either. I don't demand from the animals that they should slave for us humans, or be in captivity for our entertainment. And I don't demand from nature that it shall exist only as a resource for the entertainment of humanity, or as a backyard to dump our waste and our emissions on.

What I advocate in regard to work, is (in the transition phase between civilization and the return to Nature) mostly four hours of volunteer work per day *, with meaningful and useful things, like health care, gardening and permaculture, eldercare, tent- and teepeemaking, selfsufficiency and so on. I advocate that we close the lion's share of our industries, which only are about polishing the wealth of the rich, a drudgery totally meaningless, comfortless, horribly inhumane.

If this is not mercy, I don't know what that word means. And if society isn't merciless, I don't know either what that word means. Society is very merciless against most humans, yes even partly towards the rich themselves, which also often have to slave. But the poor in the third world have to carry the heaviest burden, and they would be the first ones to rejoice if we in the

west dismantled civilization, so that the third world would be liberated to live as their ultimate ancestors, a life of selfsufficiency, instead of having to serve the rich part of the world, as the slaves of the rich ones. Slavery has namely never been abolished, it has only changed form, it has only moved to the periphery of civilization (and even in the centre slavery often flourish).

This mercy towards myself and others make that I rather live as a homeless than go to ordinary work. I namely think the homeless way is much, much more merciful than slavery and apartment, especially when I can live in a hut and a cave in the forest. Because it protects my freedom to do what is meaningful, what I love, which is to read, write and cultivate permaculture (I love especially planting fruit trees).

* I'm very careful with dispelling the myth that it would be heavy to return to the lifestyle of the indigenous people, and that it somehow would imply a sacrifice, as many fear, and which is a step in many peoples defense of civilization. I think the truth is the opposite, that the indigenous people live much easier lives than many civilized ones, and that we need to "work" at least twice less if we live as the indigenous people, with much more time for social intercourse, culture and play.

Why I don't like mathematics

I have previously expressed a contempt for mathematics, and called it "the science of death". But when I think deeper about the matter, it is thanks to mathematics that atheism has been able to take root in the world. And actually I'm an atheist. Mathematics hasn't found any god. And would we come to that conclusion without mathematics and its children physics and the other natural sciences? I don't think so. Mathematics has liberated us from much superstition, because science builds on mathematics.

But yet I hold to my view that mathematics is a science of death. It is for better or for worse, and I think the bad is greater than the good. Because it is with the help of mathematics we have destroyed this planet, and it is because of mathematics that nature often is just numbers and resources for humanity, without inherent sanctity. I would rather choose to remain in Stone Age superstition with the planet intact, than to be a scientifically enlightened human but with a destroyed planet. Life is more important than mathematics and numbers, more important than being right in everything. We still know so little that the difference between us and Stone Age human isn't so big when one looks at us from a "perfect" knowledge. There is a hell of a lot that we don't know, not least about life on other planets in the universe with life on them, and other universes with life in them, in the infinite number of universes. Faced with this there is no greater difference between us and the Stone Age man than between a knowledgeable and a little knowledgeable ant.

Why do one absolutely have to put numbers on everything (the Piraha-people in Amazonas has no words for specific numbers. Instead of "one, two, three" it's "a few, some, and many")., control everything with numbers, "be right" about everything? Isn't it better to accept the limits of ones knowledge, instead of

all the time chasing unattainable knowledge? Isn't this what all humility is about? Why is it so important to "know"? Isn't it more important to Live? We have in civilization distanced ourselves from Life itself with all our knowledge, with our superintellectualism. Life isn't about overcoming everything through knowledge, but to take part in the stream of life that surrounds us, equal with the rest of creation. The exaggerated knowledge makes us to the lords of the earth, and is a part of the colonialistic project that civilization deep down is about. The most important knowledge that life has to offer us, the ecological knowledge, environmental ethics, we had as an instinct before civilization was born. We knew instinctively to live in harmony with our surroundings, which according to me is by far the most important knowledge. In comparison with that the mathematical knowledge is pure garbage, pure poop, as I have written before.

We believe that civilization has invented the ecological knowledge, despite it being in our instincts for millions of years. And before the industrial revolution in agriculture all farms were organic. The ecological science arose first as a reaction to a cancerous civilization, which it itself was a part of. Wouldn't it be better if we hadn't eaten from the tree of knowledge, and stayed in our pre-civilized humility? I believe so. The tree of knowledge is for better and for worse, and eating from it ejects us from paradise, our primeval state equal with the other animals and plants, our animal origins. Exaggerated knowledge is the root of our civilized hubris. Life is about Living, not about sitting and thinking. Our universities are cancer tumours on Mother Earth. The civilized thought is a mental cancer, and I find it also in me, and in the content of this book.

The exaggerated knowledge leads us inevitably to a robot society, to space technology and cloning. And to pursue such things instead of feeding the hungry Africans.

We don't need much knowledge to be able to act ethically, to feed the hungry Africans. Morality is much an instinct. We already have far more knowledge than needed to feed all the hungry Africans. Yet we don't do it. It's because exaggerated knowledge, the fact that we think more than we act has made us crazy.

Civilization resembles an alcoholic

"Oilholic economists don't, to phrase it drastically, differ much from drug addicts, for which the future is indifferent as long as they get their next fix"

(Clause Leggewise/Harald Weltzer in the book *"The end of the world as we know it"*, [Swedish: "Slutet på världen som vi känner den"] Daidalos 2010)

We all know about the hell of the alcoholic, how they swing from booze to hangover. The hangover is the toil one endures because one parties on one's leisure time, with all kinds of luxuries, i.e. the drunkenness. The whole thing is manic-depressive.

Is the luxury really worth all the toil, one can ask oneself. The same question one can ask the alcoholic; is his booze really worth the hangover? Isn't it better to live in balance between the

negative and the positive, to level out the exaggerated roller coaster? Doesn't too big swings entail a suffering? And this not only for oneself, but also for one's surroundings?

The partying of civilization on its resources really resembles the booze of the alcoholic. And as the health of the alcoholic begins to suffer, we also see the sad consequences of the boozes of civilization – a destroyed nature. The alcoholic gets a destroyed liver, brain damages, and a lot more, civilization gets a destroyed nature and climate change.

Wouldn't it be better to live simply, with a steady and small amount of suffering in the everyday life, instead of partying so much and constantly having to go through deep sufferings in the hangover? To be able to party so much, one namely has to slave eight hours of workdays or more, often a comfortless, meaningless slavery, which mostly benefits the rich ones. And one gets so much money from it that one can shop, live in luxury and party wildly. And the more one lives in luxury, the more hours one has to work every day. Twelve hours of workdays isn't quite unusual either, it's familiar to me in my early youth. One becomes like a working robot in such circumstances, yes even with eight hour days. One loses one's humanity. And one begins to demand the same from one's fellow humans, so that everything can work out.

I believe that oil is the most important parallel that civilization has to alcohol. We are sickly dependent on oil, and society would collapse if oil didn't flow. It all resembles the alcoholic who firstly gets big kicks from the alcohol, but then gets less and less yields from it (he/she have to drink more and more to get the same booze-effect), and finally he/she drinks just to stay normal, not to collapse (it functions like drugs).

To get oil, countries are ready to go to war (as USA). But, as the Peak Oil- movement has pointed out, cheap oil is about to end. An apparent sign of this is the oil sand extraction in Alberta, Canada. The founder of the Transition Town-movement Rob Hopkins has compared this biggest industrial project in the world (with 121 500 employees only in Alberta, and an oil sand extraction area that covers over 500 km²) with an alcoholic who visits a bar, but it is out of beer. Then he boils the broadloom which lies on the floor by the disk, to get out the few beer drops which have run down on the carpet, and drinks this strange brew to quench his gigantic thirst for alcohol. Something similar can also be said about the fracking industry, which much lies behind the fact that we have an oil glut by now, with relatively low oil prices. But the fracking industry doesn't survive so low oil prices, which lies behind the fast decline that the industry has experienced quite recently.

David Jonstad on the Effect blog (Effektbloggen) wrote 2010 what follows: *"Every time I read about the oil sand in Canada it looks like the evilness on earth. It is as brought from the dirty mining operation on the planet Pandora in the movie Avatar, or from the orch factory of Saruman in the Lord of the Rings. Monster excavators work frenetically with digging out the mixture of oil and sand from the soil of Alberta. Sick amounts of energy (especially fossil natural gas) is consumed in the process, as well as oceans of water. Hitherto the activity has generated 136 km² of ponds with poisonous water."*

"Dear future generations: Please accept our apologies. We were rolling drunk on petroleum."

(Kurt Vonnegut on Twitter 12.9. 2014)

When it becomes more important to "be right" than to "live rightly"

I believe that an important cause of the environmental problems is a certain mental cancer in civilization, which amounts to it being more important to "be right" than to "live rightly". Knowledge is more important than morality. We see this in the universities and in the corporations, which are totally focusing on building up knowledge, while they neglect moral education. This results in moral cripples, which destroy the planet and the third world through their activity, especially in the various so-called multinational corporations and industries.

But is it so important to be right in everything, to have gigantic amounts of right knowledge in one's brain? I don't think so. We did well without it for millions of years, when we lived like the nonhuman animals and as hunter-gatherers. We actually don't need the universities, because we manage well with the lifestyle of our ultimate ancestors, with the lifestyle of the nonhuman animals. This also had the lucky side-effect that it didn't destroy the planet, i.e. it was one essentially moral lifestyle, which ensured the grandchildren a livable planet.

Knowledge isn't the most important thing in life. Love is, to live for something that is bigger than one's ego, for the tribe, for nature. We can be moral beings even if we are wrong in many scientific questions, even if we are superstitious and believe in spirits and totem animals. Of course it's best if we wouldn't be superstitious, but we also can manage morally with some superstition intact. And when we go into the collapse phase of civilization, and the universities don't work any more, we are forced to have some superstitions (by the way, everybody has some superstitions, even now), because we won't have access to knowledge as before, especially when internet collapses. And when medical science collapses, we are maybe forced to partly rely on old folk belief in medical science, wild herbs and the like. We will have to trust our intuition in a lot of questions, when we are not able to do scientific experiments any longer. If we then have avoided training our intuition, but only trusted experts, we stand empty-handed when the collapse comes, and we maybe easier fall victims to destructive superstition.

I advocate, however, that we after all save so much of our scientific achievements as possible when the time comes when we are forced to leave civilization, when it collapses. I still believe in the scientific method when we shall decide what is true. But at the end of the day we have to trust our intuition, when Babylon falls. We will, however, have our books with us for a long time after the collapse, so we are in a better shape than our ancestors in the Stone Age when it comes to avoiding superstition.

How it looks like on my horizon. How I believe I will die

There are two big threats against the survival of humanity and civilization. One of these is depleting oil resources after we have passed peak oil, and the other is the collapse of the ecosystems as a result of runaway climate change. It is difficult to decide which of these threats is the biggest one to humanity, but I suppose climate change will have the biggest impact. Climate change implies that humanity simply might go extinct, while depleting oil resources don't need to have so drastic effects.

I believe both of these threats will in the first place result in a lack of food. The depleting oil resources will make it difficult for food to be transported long distances, when the vehicles which transports it need oil. And the runaway climate change will kill off a great part of the harvest, gradually more and more.

So it looks like on my horizon. I believe both these threats are going to create "the perfect storm", and they are going to take place parallelly with each other, about at the same time. Add then to this even the economic crisis, the financial crisis, and we arrive at the three E:s which the Transition Town Movement talks about; energy, ecology and economy, which all collapses gradually, parallelly with each other, about at the same time, and which all are related to each other, dependent on each other.

And I believe that all this will happen during this century, earliest in about one decade, latest in fifty to hundred years. Much is going to happen during my lifetime.

I don't believe that I will die of sickness or of age, but of starvation. But I'm not afraid of dying of starvation. It is a way to die that is not so terribly painful. It is like fasting, one gets "high" (says my ex-girlfriend Titti, who is an expert on fasting, and has fasted much).

I hope the end becomes sacred and chivalrous, as the title of the book by ecopsychologist Carolyn Baker, called "*Sacred demise. Walking the spiritual path of industrial civilization's collapse*" (2009). I don't want chaos on the streets and market places. I hope our leaders are smart enough so they choose a controlled dismantling instead of evil and sudden death and chaos. That they now begin to prepare for the inevitable. I have a hope that we can face the end of civilization with equanimity, not panic. And that we understand deep in our hearts that so it has to go, and that we shouldn't fight it, but let the collapse of civilization run its course, though preferably in a controlled way. That we understand that the collapse of civilization is something good for the rest of the planet, for the ecosystems.

Slavery has not been abolished

There is a myth in the society today that slavery was abolished in the nineteenth century. It's not true. Slavery was not abolished, only one of its worst deviations. Civilization has always required slavery, and requires it to this day. "The Delegation for human rights in Sweden" writes: "*But UN calculates that at least twelve million people despite this live under slave-like conditions all over the world, while many organizations estimate that it comes down to 27 million.*"

This is especially relevant with regard to so called "cheap labour force" in the third world, with child labour, child soldiers, human trafficking and so on. There is also a form of slavery which is called "debt slavery", which is the most usual form of slavery. "*It begins when poor people borrow money to cover an unforeseen cost, for example health care. They get stuck in a vicious circle where they have to work to pay the debt forever, because the interest rate is higher than the salary*", "The Delegation for human rights in Sweden" writes.

There are also those, like for example I and the anarchist philosopher Noam Chomsky, who suggest that "wage bondage" is a form of slavery, and that we should abolish money and only work as volunteers, with what we like to do.

Wikipedia writes in the Swedish article about Noam Chomsky: "*In his book For Reasons of State from 1973 Chomsky argued that a society can function without any paid labour force, unlike the capitalist system where people are "wage slaves" or an authoritarian society where decisions are made by central committees. He suggests that the population of a country should be free to seek and exercise the jobs they themselves wish for. Humans will then be free to do what they wish for and the jobs which they deliberately exercise will be both "rewarding in themselves" and "socially useful". Society would be peacefully anarchistic, without any state or other authoritarian institutions. Work which is fundamentally disgusting for everyone, if there exists such a thing at all, would be distributed to all people.*"

Why do we believe that slavery has been abolished, and that people are not slaves even though they go to work as wage slaves and think the work is a heavy burden? I think it depends on us seeing civilization as something good, as something to toil for, something to fight for. We don't see the sacrifices civilization demands from the third world and nature. Civilization doesn't only demand cheap slave labour force from the third world, it also destroys nature. We believe that we are useful when we toil for the maintaining of civilization. But maybe we should work for dismantling slavery and with it civilization? Do we really need all these unnecessary industries and businesses which civilization offers us? Are they really useful? Or do they only contribute to the burdening of people and nature? I think we could very well manage with the standard of living of Stone Age people, and do volunteer work only three, four hours a day without salary, as they did, with things which are really needed. The money system results in an army of unnecessary industries and businesses, which grow like weed in the garden, and which only is burdening for us and nature. Money should be abolished, like Chomsky suggests.

What is the actual difference between slaves on the cotton fields in America in the eighteenth century and the wage slaves of our time? Not much, especially in the third world. Maybe only that the latter don't understand that they are slaves, they don't believe that they are forced to work. But if they don't work, or search for jobs, they don't get any money, and can't pay the rent, and become homeless and outcast. They are thus whipped to go on working, because nobody wants to end up outside the fellowship and become homeless and outcast (however, I have experienced the total homelessness many times, and it's not so heavy when one have a hut to sleep in in the forest!).

The cotton fields in America were not dismantled when slavery was “abolished”. The slaves were just replaced with “free” workers. But the work was equally heavy, and how free were these workers actually? They were chained to the same machinery to feed the British imperium as the black slaves had been. Their chains were only more invisible. And so it has been everywhere in civilization since then.

Something about permaculture

(Excerpt from a vagabond travel report about visiting the ecovillages of southern Sweden during the summer 2016)

Here is an effort to explain what permaculture is:

Permaculture is an ecological way of relating to existence; which implies sustainability, carrying capacity and circular ecology. It can be applied to all areas of life, but usually it is used in gardening. Permaculture in gardening implies working with instead of against nature (ordinary non-organic monocultural farming, works, as is well known, often against nature, and impoverishes and poisons the soil), where one tries to imitate nature, and where nature is the master. One tries to build up soil instead of impoverishing it, work with the processes of nature instead of against them. Permaculture in gardening often deals with composting, cover crops and forest gardens.

Cover crops is about covering the soil instead of turning it over to get rid of the weed, and then one builds lasagna beds where one fills up with compost, grass clippings, twigs, old leaves, horse manure, all kinds of compostable things one can find. And after one has sown or planted out the plants, one covers the soil, often with grass clippings, straw or old leaves, so that the moisture is kept in the soil, and so that one doesn't need to weed. Cover crops implies that one saves much work – with things like turning over the soil, watering and weeding.

Forest gardening implies that one cultivates in several levels. One builds up an edible forest, where one can cultivate ordinary trees, fruit trees, nut trees and berry bushes, perennial edible plants and farthest down vegetables in lasagna beds. One builds up the forest so that all plants complement and support each other, and one often constructs a pond in relation to the forest, which gives a favourable micro climate. Forest gardens give so much food, that it has been calculated that they give two to twenty times as much food as the same area would give if it was cultivated according to ordinary monocultural farming methods. Forest gardens can become an important answer to present or future challenges in food supply. The only thing is that it demands time and patience.

This is what humanity should be pursuing on a massive scale, instead of sport industry, film industry, candy industry, tobacco industry and so on. When will humanity come to its senses and begin to be interested in things that really matters?



(picture text: I help Sirpa to cultivate cover crops on Änggärdet ecovillage. Photo: Titti Spaltro above and beneath)



The lovely anarchy of nature. Work as a hobby.

The non-human nature is by far ruled by anarchy, I would dare to argue. Even if there is flock behaviour and flock leaders in nature, it is yet very anarchistic, because no one is forced to go against their nature by any leader, as in civilization. The reason for this is that leaders and subjects have evolved together for millions of years (as opposed to leaders and subjects in civilization), so that everyone follow their instincts, which are evolved to fulfil a function in nature. Everything is thus organic, as opposed to the mechanical relation that bosses and subordinates have in civilization. No one needs to command the animals and the insects (not to mention the plants), or stand above them saying that they don't get any salary if they don't play their part. They do it spontaneously, from love of life. It makes anarchy working in nature. It would also work among humans if everyone followed their instincts, and refused to do what one doesn't like. Because I believe that man, as much as the animals, insects and plants, becomes ecological and useful for the ecosystem when he/she follows his/her instincts. If no one commanded us with threats that we don't get any money if we don't obey, yes, then we wouldn't chop down rainforests, build cars, stand by the disk or checkout, drill after oil, build

nuclear power, build weapons, wage war, produce tobacco and alcohol, yes then we would skip the **incredible amount of unnecessary industries** we have invented, and take control over ourselves through anarchy, and only do the most important things, what we do from pure love of life, like gardening, fishing and gathering our own food to us and our dear ones. Then we would not wear ourselves out every day, but have a lot of time for social life and for play. And work would become like a hobby. There would not be any division into work and leisure time.

Why do we actually need to have bosses and leaders who command us what we shall do? Do we really like so little what we do that we have to be commanded to do it, and get paid for it? Animals don't need any money or wealth, there work is like a hobby, a play, the work is its own salary. It is when one doesn't like one's work, that one needs salary, becoming rich as a compensation.

When I study butterflies and bumblebees which fly from flower to flower, and carry out an incredibly important work, then it's anarchy and hobby I'm seeing. They are totally one with their work, they don't understand how useful they are. They just follow their instincts, do what they are created to do since time immemorial. Likewise, when I see a cow who chews at grass. Her work is to refine and ennoble the soil with her poop, and it's all deeply satisfying and hobby-like, yes playlike.

But when I study building workers or cleaners, then I see slavery and patriarchalism. They often strive and have a hard time, they often think they get too little salary, and look forward to the end of the workday, when they finally get to do what they like. So it was at least for me when I worked as a house painter for three long years. I didn't look forward to a new workday, and I hurried from the job at three o'clock. I didn't work five minutes more than I had to, sometimes less.

We have in civilization alienated ourselves from what work is in nature; a deeply satisfying, instinctive hobby. This is the price we have to pay for lifting ourselves above the other animals. I dare to argue that only a minority, of more creative professionals, like artists, poets, authors, musicians, philosophers and some scientists, really enjoy their work. I don't think the majority does it (though many wouldn't admit that it is heavy to work). And the characteristics for these mentioned professionals is that they often want to do what they do even if they don't receive any money. I feel like this with my reading, blog writing, my vagabonding and my troubadour activity. It is like a hobby for me. I have sacrificed my comfort and become homeless to be able to do this full-time, so much I love this work, and so much I hate the wage bondage.

Something I love most in the non-human nature, is its great absence of coercion. Indeed there is alpha males, bee queens and ant queens, but mostly there is a great liberty reigning in nature, and where anarchy doesn't reign, where there are leaders, the animals and insects are allowed to follow their instincts anyway. Nowhere we find tyrants which command their servants to go against their nature, to practice slavery, as there is in civilization. In civilization work has been disconnected from necessity, so that one practices a lot of completely unnecessary, and deeply destructive slavery work, which besides is completely decoupled from enjoyment and play, to which work is connected when it's instinctive, as it is by the

animals and insects. And civilization demands that one works all too much to accumulate a lot of wealth that one doesn't at all need, things that are not at all worthy of the eight hours of work that one performs. The simple, poor life has quite enough of enjoyments, not least the enjoyment to have plenty of time*. Isn't that our most important resource and enjoyment, to have a lot of leisure time, or to be able to do what we love? Isn't this much better than slaving and doing stuff one doesn't like, to be able to, on one's short leisure time, party, travel and get a lot of stuff? Being time rich, that's really being genuinely rich, not being time poor and have a lot of wealth and investments.

* All poor people don't have plenty of time. There are many poor in the third world who are working too much. But generally speaking both people in the west and the third world would get more leisure time if we lived a more simple life, and thus needed to work less.

Why I don't believe dogs are fascistic

Answer to the blogcommentator "Leon", who suggested that dogs and other animals are basically fascists:

What is fascism? I think we first have to agree about that, before we can decide the question if dogs are fascistic or not. Fascism is thus defined on the Swedish Wikipedia:

"Fascism...is an authoritarian political ideology...Fascism is often associated with a mass movement, elite rule and the meaning is that the individual is subordinated to the need of the state. Fascism further want to create a strong national identity. Different scholars emphasize different characteristic features in fascism, but a usually occurring model summarize it as an opposition to communism, conservatism and liberalism (political and economic), with the goal of building a nationalistic and authoritarian state, not bound by tradition. Fascism prefers a...secular and imperialistic culture, often expressed in mass meetings, nationalromantic and mythic symbols, mass mobilization and a militarized political life, often including a paramilitary milis."

I don't think it's possible to apply the word fascism on animals. The word contains too much human politics. For fascism to arise, there have to be a state, a nation. Animals are not nationalistic. They have no overall nation, but every animal flock is completely self-governing.

Maybe Leon thinks about how wild wolf flocks are hierarchical, and associate hierarchy with fascism? I don't think we can equate hierarchy with fascism so easily. Hierarchy appears in all human and nonhuman contexts, whether fascistic or not. It isn't possible to avoid, it is one of our existential basic conditions into which we are "thrown" (speaking with the philosopher Martin Heidegger). We can fight it, we can mitigate it, but it isn't possible to avoid it completely. Even in anarchistic communities there are inofficial hierarchies and inofficial leaders. Total anarchy and total equality is a utopia, which we indeed have to pursue, but it would be self-deception to argue that just in our anarchistic group there are no hierarchies.

However, sanctioning hierarchies, that begins to approach fascism. But are the dogs up to that? Don't you think that even they, just like man, have a (however small) longing for equality? Don't you think that they even partly can fight for it, while they find themselves "thrown" into hierarchies, as something unavoidable? Isn't a state required for hierarchies to be sanctioned? The dogs have no states, they are in fact quite anarchistic by nature, they form small "anarchistic", self-governing flocks in the wild nature. Or is anarchy too strong a word to use for dog flocks in the wild nature? I don't know, but it is the word I find closest, when I shall describe how they are governed. They have no centralised, nationalistic dog government, indeed flock leaders, but even human anarchist communities has got that, at least unofficially. Dogs have no official government.

It is when hierarchies are linked up to authoritarianism, that fascism arises. Are the dogs authoritarian? I have never noticed anything like that. And I have pretty good experience of dogs. I associate authoritarianism with political and religious conservatism, with brainwashing and enslaving other creatures, with taming of the wild and our natural impulses and instincts. Dogs have no project afoot to tame the wild and their and our natural impulses/instincts. Just the opposite. I think they actually long for the wild, free nature. They surely want to live as wolves, after all, live in their right element, the wild nature.

Do the dogs try to brainwash and enslave other creatures? I have never noticed anything like that, and this is, I think, the essential in all authoritarianism. No one is forced to be included in a wolf flock. One has the right to refrain from it, starve, or turn to other flocks. But in our authoritarian Swedish society we are forced to attend the carousel, we don't even have the right to take our own life. We don't even decide over our own death. Then the authoritarianism has gone far. And if we differ too much, we are incarcerated. Dogs and wolves don't do such things (and they don't put anyone in concentration camps, not least). They maybe fight a little among themselves, but they don't at least incarcerate each other. They can't. I would rather get hurt in a chivalrous fight with other "males", than to be incarcerated in sterile, unnatural rooms, empty of all wild nature. I have experience of being beaten almost unconscious in Spain with a club (because I had released a lot of animals), and I got big bruises over my whole body, and even fever. I didn't go to the hospital, but I let nature take care of everything. My injuries were healed in a few days, and I felt a huge mercy in the healing powers of the body and nature*. I would much rather choose that than being locked up. One scares people to subordination and slavery with threats of incarceration, it is one of the foremost tools of authoritarianism, whether it is incarceration in mental hospital or prison.

I would also add that imperialism is an important ingredient in fascism. Are dogs and wolves imperialistic? I have never noticed anything like that. Wolves in the wild nature stay inside their ecological niche, and live in relative harmony with their environment. Nature regulates their number, therefore imperialism can't arise. If something like that would arise, they would soon not find preys anymore, they would soon exterminate their prey, and go under in the process. But this is not real imperialism, real imperialism arises first in man, when one all the time overcomes the balancing mechanisms of the wild nature, which would make sure that one doesn't become too numerous. Overcomes it with inventions, with "cleverness", as this folly is called. And overcomes it to the point where the

whole health of the planet is threatened. That is what real imperialism is about. In this sense the whole civilization is fascistic. Empires would never arise if one constantly would let nature balance the population, with the natural mechanism that exists (I don't mean genocides and war). It is when one lifts oneself above nature and its balancing mechanisms, that true imperialism is born. Wolf flocks don't get bigger and bigger all the time. They don't lift themselves above nature, their flock doesn't get cancerous, like civilization.

All this results in the questions; are animals good or evil? Is nature good or evil? Is reality good or evil? It is a quite silly question, because the answer is so apparent. Most of us experience existence as something fundamentally good, when everything is allowed to be as it is, naturally and without any coercion. In the normal everyday life. This is the basis for the hardly extinguishable love of life that we all have. Existence, nature, is good so long as it isn't hurt, and the animals are a part of this goodness!

* This is a holy experience for me, which strengthened my confidence in the goodness of nature. Just think what is in progress in our bodies to maintain it and heal it! It's incredibly strong powers! And they are on our side, on the side of life!

The "Back to the sources"-motif. Back to nature and the animal kingdom

I have noticed that in the history of civilization renewal movements in art, literature, theology, philosophy and much else, are often led by a "back to the sources" - motif. It is "back to antiquity!" (as in the renaissance), "back to the bible!" (as in the reformation and christian revival movements), "back to nature!" (as by Rousseau and partly by romanticism), "back to emotion, fantasy and myth!" (as in romanticism).

Apparently we are renewed through learning about our origins. And behind the "back to the sources"- motif, lies the myth about the golden age and the gradual decline of humanity. The feeling that it was better before.

I can recognise myself and my philosophy "animalism" in this motif. I just think that one isn't enough radical in this reestablishing of our origins. We have to "go back", not only to the antiquity or Stone Age (as the anarchoprimitivists want), but to our ultimate origins in the animal kingdom. We are after all animals! We have to "go back" to the animal kingdom, and begin to live in harmony with our animal nature, whatever this means. Becoming instinctive, honest, playful, grounded, ecological, one with the soil and nature, one with matter. Come down from our intellectualistic prison up in our heads, down from the academic cold, come out from the corridors of glory and power, come down into the humble attitude to life that characterizes cows, horses and pigs. Become poor, modest and unpretentious like the animals.

And above all else we have to begin cleaning up the mess we have created on earth, restore nature and dismantle civilization, which is nothing else than a megacancer on Mother Earth. We have to function like a doctor who has found cancer in the patient, and begins to treat the cancer with different methods.

To die before death. To practice dying, practice unselfishness

I think to some extent about death, and how it would feel not to exist any more. I'm both fascinated by the thought, and find it a little scary. And it is my ego that finds it scary. How can I stop existing? Where do I go? How can a day come when I don't exist any more?

When I think unselfishly, outside of my ego, then death is not scary. I have managed to be dead for billions of years before I was born, without suffering from it, so I shall manage it after death, too. And I will become life to nature! And I will create space for other life when I disappear, space for our descendants, space for plants and animals*!

To think in this manner is for me to practice dying, to practice unselfishness. Death hurts our ego, so thinking a lot about death ("memento mori") is a form of practicing death to self.

The old mystics spoke a lot of "death to self" and about "dying before death". I think they had a lot of wisdom here.

Simone Weil (whom I have mentioned before) has meant a lot to me in this regard. She had a image of God where God created the world through withdrawing, through "decreation". And we are, according to her, called to follow in the footsteps of this God. We have to withdraw, so that there is room for other life than ourselves. It is this wisdom nature has got with its phenomenon of death. And even if I don't believe in God any longer, I still believe in the principle of "decreation". It has to permeate our whole society if we shall have a chance to survive this century. Because isn't it just the practice of the art of dying that we have lost in civilization? We fight death with every possible means, and thus miss to see that it is needed for other life than ourselves to exist, for other nature than ourselves to exist. The doctors swear an oath that they shall save life at any cost, and the result is overpopulation, that death is swept under the table and isn't a part of the daily life, as it is in wild nature. We fight frenetically all pandemics, which maybe were the way of nature to limit the population, in order that the ecological balance could be maintained in nature.

We have become too numerous. It's a great tragedy, and it has devastating effects on the ecosystem. It has lead to our having a death debt to nature, as I have pointed out before. Our civilization is a bubble, and when the bubble bursts, then our death debt is revealed, that we owe nature a lot of deaths, and actually we shouldn't be able to be so numerous, were it not for technology and oil, which have blown up the population bubble. When it bursts, a lot of people will die. Either from war or famine or plague.

Climate change is only one of the countless symptoms of our becoming too numerous. We have gotten hubris, and the "nemesiss" of nature awaits.

To process what we have done with nature, this is "memento mori" to me. To process the grief over what we have done, and realise that my death maybe comes too early because of this. I hope I, when this time comes, can receive death with open arms, being involved in creating room for Mother Earth and all her beautiful creatures, in order that she maybe can heal, and avoid the fate of planet Venus.

* These are the benefits of death. The bad ones exist, too, indeed, as it is a tragedy every time a really good human dies, an enthusiast for human and animal rights, an eco-author, a climate warrior. They are often irreplaceable. Also if oneself is doing a lot of good, one has a reason for fearing death, so that it won't deprive the world of the good one does. Here one could say that death is somewhat scary, and that it can be unselfish to fear death. This is just some nuancing of what I have said in this chapter.

Death is ecological

Death is awful, I admit, but I desperately try to find redeeming features in it. And I find such features. Have you ever thought the thought that death is in fact ecological? Isn't that a form of consolation in the middle of death's cruelty? **Death is a condition** for the life that comes after us and other animals and plants, without it everything would stack on top of each other and existence would become an intolerable show in war, nuisance and nature destruction, yes life would be plagued with a tremendous overpopulation if life would be eternal *. Not only that, death also causes suffering to end, that suffering is not eternal. We should tank death for the fact that suffering ends when it becomes too heavy for the body, when it can't cope any more.

Then we also have the fact that death makes cruelty not eternal, makes civilizational cancer not eternal.

The ecosystem builds upon the life-and-death-cycle. Life have to be sacrificed in order for other life to be thriving. It is inscribed in the laws of ecology; one man's loss is another man's gain. Without this no nature and no ecology would be possible. But religion, and especially Christianity, always has been at odds with these laws with their demand for eternal life, and it would not surprise me if Christianity has a big debt to the environmental crisis of today with its linear thinking, at odds with the circular cycle-thinking of ecology. An ideology that fights death at any cost and demands eternal life, will irresistibly begin to fight the ecosystem itself, and this is precisely what religion has done. Religion constitutes the very base of the emergence of civilization, with its hierarchical thinking, its placing of man as the lord of nature, and its striving to reach beyond nature to a transcendental realm, instead of being satisfied with nature, with reality. The dream about eternal life also live on in secular form in several scientist's dream of eternal life through the future achievements of technology, through uploading one's consciousness onto the internet, or refrigerating our bodies in the moment of death, to be resurrected when science has overcome death.

Wishing for eternal life is about as smart as wishing for a mountain of candy to champ for the rest on one's life, the wish is childish, infantile, incredibly naive and silly. Everything one gets too much of, becomes worthless at last, thus the natural laws goes. And one can't pass the law of entropy, which actually is at the core of the laws of life and death in nature. Everything depletes and eventually passes on into disorder, into "waste", into death, and becomes nourishment to new life, in a constant cycle.

I believe that the present ecological crisis of civilization in fact also is a crisis in its relation to death, this relation have to change if humanity shall have any chance to survive this century. We have to abandon the view of death being only an enemy to combat, seeing the ecological value in it, see that it fills a good function in life. Yes, death is cruel, but isn't it so mostly from the perspective of the ego? From the perspective of the whole, of ecology and unselfishness, death can in fact be something good, something to welcome the day we ourselves shall die.

* Even if life would be eternal in the meaning that it goes on in the spirit world after the physical death, it makes existence nevertheless unbearable. It becomes like an eternal football game. Life becomes cheap if it goes on forever. And for the criminals it would become an unbearable hell (if one believes the Christian fundamentalists). Lucky for the criminals that there is no life after death.

How oil addiction resembles drug addiction

I have a close friend who is a drug addict (even though he wouldn't think so himself). By him I get the opportunity to study the essence of drug addiction. How the drug offers less and less yields as time goes on, so it at last takes as much of the drug to keep normal, as it took in the beginning to get a real kick from the drug.

This reminds me of something; the oil addiction of our civilization. In the beginning of the history of oil production our society got substantial kicks from the oil, an incredible expansion of the economy took place gradually because of oil. And one believed in practice that this expansion would go on forever. But now the global economy doesn't grow like before (because of the financial crisis), even though we use incredibly much more oil than in the beginning of the history of oil production, and even though the oil use increases all the time. Now we have to have all this oil just so that civilization won't collapse totally. The collapse already awaits in the fringes of civilization because Peak Oil and climate change, and we delay the collapse through scraping up oil from incredibly expensive oil sources like tar sands, fracking and deep offshore oil, which make oil just more and more expensive to extract. The age of cheap oil is soon gone, or is maybe already gone.

This process has, by the anthropologist and collapse theorist Joseph Tainter, been called to be afflicted by "diminishing marginal returns". In the beginning of civilization investments in increasing complexity gave great marginal returns. But gradually new investments in increasing complexity are afflicted by diminishing marginal returns. This happens already in the oil industry where one invests trillions (thousands of billions) of dollars just to maintain the present oil production, or increase it a little bit. All great oil fields are already discovered long ago, and now one has to do an incredibly demanding work in an incredible amount of small oil fields just to keep oil industry alive. Doesn't this resemble drug addiction pretty much?

Oil industry isn't just a drug industry, it is the most cancerous industry in civilization (this is most visible in the tar sands of Alberta, Canada). Apparently civilization has been afflicted with cancer, and that cancer is us as civilized people. One can

get cancer from smoking, and maybe there is a connection between the oil dependency in society and the cancer tumour it has developed into? Oil is the very life blood of civilization.

One also get flabby, passivated and stupid from drug addiction. One loses one's critical ability, and gets easily stuck in a hypochondriachal mental reality. Isn't this also what we see with the civilized peoples, especially the rich ones, which are among the greatest oil drug addicts? Where is the critical ability among them? Where is the intellectual conscience, the intellectual morality? Where are the environmental ethics among them, where the sense for reality, for nature? The rich ones appear to have gotten stuck in a psychosis, in an imaginary reality, exactly as many drug addicts get stuck in their drug psychoses (so has happened with my drug addict friend, he says for example that "everything is true", that f.ex. all religions are true at the same time).

It is also usual that drug addicts, when a mild drug has lost its effect, turn to other, often heavier drugs. Aren't we seeing this in the pursuit of civilization for alternative energy sources, which shall replace oil when it depletes? All these alternative sources are not equally dangerous (often not the renewable energy sources), but there are many environmental friends (like James Lovelock and Mark Lynas) who propagate for nuclear power, and this I think is even worse than oil, a heavier drug than the oil drug, given what can happen to the nuclear power if humanity goes extinct, which it maybe will. According to Guy McPherson we might experience that the over 450 nuclear power plants of the world undergo a meltdown if civilization experiences an oil or climate related abrupt collapse that leads to the extinction of humanity.

Another alternative energy source, ethanol, which is extracted from crops like corn and palm oil, has not only a very low net energy, but is also said to have even more emissions than ordinary gasoline and diesel, because of the amount of energy that goes into cultivating, fertilizing, transporting and treating the crops so that ethanol can be produced. Moreover it takes up precious agricultural land, which should have been used to nourish the starving people of the world. Ethanol is also likely a heavier drug than gasoline and diesel.

And finally oil addiction reminds of drug addiction, not least in the fact that civilization is ready to do almost anything to get its next oil kick. Just think of how USA has made war in the Middle East to secure its oil import. So only desperate drug addicts do.

To reverse the evolution of humanity

I'm advocating that humanity "evolves back", goes backwards in evolution, back to a part of the animal kingdom again, the animal kingdom which we have lifted ourselves above by means of civilization and technology. But is this possible at all?, you might wonder. I don't think so, if a collapse doesn't force us back to the Stone Age. I think a more likely scenario is that we persist with our civilization until climate change ends humanity, ignoring all warning signals. Yes, I even believe that humanity doesn't have free will considered as a whole, and that we as individual persons therefore **ultimately** don't have free will*. Because no one has actually control over the civilizing process, even though the conspiracy theorists would argue the opposite.

A few are awakening to revolt against civilization here and there, but they are so few that they stand powerless. I don't know about many people who want to "evolve back" to the animal kingdom, most just shake their head at it. And yet I think it is the only logical thing one can do now when the essence of civilization is revealed in step with climate change, Peak Oil and neocolonialism. What civilization leads to should be quite apparent by now; depleting resources and a sick planet, sick from cancer, with the risk of dying of it. Even though I consider it being game over for humanity's chances of survival, I nevertheless want to fight for our "going back" on our roads (however keeping the good we have learned). I want to fight for animalism in a kind of despairingly desperate hope that the climate will not make us extinct anyway, that it instead lets civilization collapse back to the Stone Age, and that we then all will come to our senses, and turn around and go back in evolution, to the lifestyle of the monkeys and the wild indigenous people. There is a small chance that Guy McPherson, Paul Ehrlich & co. are wrong, and that we will be able to reverse the evolution of mankind. In front of us is a wall; the climate wall and the Peak Oil wall, and there are just two options; to head into the wall and disappear, or to go "back" and survive.

Seven years ago I got the idea that the evolution of humanity in the future would divide into two parts, one which went forward and one which went back to the animal kingdom. Nowadays I think we only have one way to go, and that is backwards. The way forward goes over a cliff without bridge. Call it reactionary, but we have now to get used to the thought that evolution not only has to go forward, but even can, and nowadays have to, go backwards. We have to slowly, bit by bit, dismantle civilization and all nuclear power plants, if we shall have a chance of surviving. And we are in the future quite forced thereto, when civilization collapses. But it's probably too late to do something, humanity will likely go extinct. That's the cliff without a bridge.

But don't misunderstand me, we can never completely re-create the past, get it exactly as it was before, in Stone Age or before it. In this way we always have to go forward. But as you maybe have understood, we have to go back in the sense that we have to pursue imitating those lifestyles of our ancestors which have been sustainable and which really have worked, like those of the monkeys and the wild indigenous peoples. But we should not jettison our useful knowledges, like medicinal knowledge, gardening knowledge and so on.

I hope people begin to discuss these questions, and ask themselves the question if it wouldn't be time to reverse the evolution of humanity, now when we see the cliff there in front of us. I hope it becomes a concept to "evolve backwards", so it would not only be a madman like me who talks about these things. Because time is running out now to turn around Titanic.

* This however, doesn't mean that we as humanity cannot change course. Even if one doesn't have free will, one is influenced by the surroundings, for better and for worse. And we will be influenced by the climate collapsing. And one can choose even if one hasn't free will, the choice is just not free, but a link in an infinitely long chain of causes. Neither I mean that one doesn't have any responsibility because one doesn't have any free will, one just doesn't have that "ultimate responsibility" which justifies revenge and lack of compassion.

The forest garden of Holma

(excerpt from a vagabond travel report about visiting the ecovillages of southern Sweden during the summer 2016)

At 28.7.2016 I and my girlfriend Titti visited the forest garden of Holma in Höör, Skåne. It was a fantastic experience, finally I got an awaited confirmation of the fact that forest gardens aren't just an unattainable hippie-dream, but really exist and work in practice! The forest garden, which was maybe 70 x 30 metres big, was a demonstration garden which began to be built by among others Esbjörn Wandt, Holma folk high school (Holma Folkhögskola) and the association "The friends of the forest garden" (Skogsträdgårdens vänner), on the initiative of the Swedish board of agriculture (Jordbruksverket). It is now open for the public, whoever can enter it and feast on its fruits, nuts and berries. I ate myself a lot of berries and an apple. They had quite many apple trees, they had pear trees, plum trees, nut trees, raspberries, strawberries, blackcurrants, redcurrants, whitecurrants, gooseberries, wild strawberries, grapes and a lot of other plants and trees whose names I didn't know.

The forest garden had a teepee (cot) at one end, something that revealed the hippiespirit in the project – a longing for our origins, for the lifestyle of the wild indigenous people. They had also a pond, something which is favourable for the microclimate.



(picture text: I in the opening of the teepee, in The forest garden of Holma. Picture by Titti Spaltro)

A forest garden is like an edible forest, one tries to imitate the ecosystem of the forest and of nature with the difference that one gets the forest garden to satisfy one's needs, too. One gets a lot of food, 2-20 times more than monocultural cultivation, this is because one cultivates in several layers, trees at the top, then nut trees, then berry bushes, then perennial plants and herbs at the bottom.

The forest garden was something of the most beautiful things I have seen in my life. This is something everyone should be pursuing, then the earth would change into a paradise, a garden of Eden for both humans and animals (we saw a snake in the forest garden!). And then the planet would get a chance to heal,

because trees capture carbon dioxide, and that would be good for the climate. The surface of the earth doesn't like being monocultural croplands, it always wants to become forest again. The building of forest gardens is to fulfil the wishes of nature, so that humans at the same time are favoured.

I think the forest garden of Holma is almost the only one of its kind in Sweden. There surely is a forest garden at the University of Stockholm, and another on a farm a little further down in Sweden, otherwise I think they are alone with this in Sweden. It's a shame, so lovely things as this should get more encouragement and money. But if one joins the association "The friends of the forest garden" (Skogsträdgårdens vänner), one can support the forming of new forest gardens.



(picture text: I in the middle of the forest garden of Holma. Picture by Titti Spaltro)



(picture text: I feast on apples in the garden of Eden. Picture by Titti Spaltro)

The collapse crawls closer and closer – the poor are affected first and notice it first

"At any time the Western house of cards could collapse. It (the financial system) is a house of cards."

(Paul Craig Roberts, American economist)

I believe that the collapse of civilization is just crawling closer and closer every day that passes. It just goes so slowly that we don't notice it. We manage to get used to it getting worse. The financial crisis has become the new normal, we have get used to the collapse in Greek, for example (there they are so desperate that they are burning their last trees). For most of us, having no overall picture of things, the financial crisis of 2008 was an anomaly, an accident, which doesn't need to be repeated if we just behave and pump bailout packages into the system, it's not seen as an inner system failure of a deeper variety. What they don't think about, is that everything has gotten worse than it was right before the financial crisis. The national debt of USA has increased with many trillions, 1,1 trillions per year, and has now reached **19,4 trillion dollars** (it's such a awful sum that it's difficult to imagine it). USA postpones the collapse through taking on new loans, and most of the other countries follow their example. It's about as smart as trying to prevent a bubble from bursting through blowing it up even more. And the global economy is really like one big bubble. We postpone the collapse through using up the resources of our descendants, through **colonizing the future**, because we have already used up our fair, sustainable share. Thus we ensure the collapse and our own ruin, because we can't steal the resources of our grand grandchildren and at the same time allow them to get a tolerable life. They will show up in a ruined world, ruined by neocolonialism and greed. The collapse will be a fact for them. And the climate will do its fair share for this to happen, because it will be much warmer then because of our emissions.

It seems like civilization tries to overcome and fool the law of entropy, when it tells itself that we can carry on like before as if the resources would be endless, whilst our descendants will do well. But overconsumption has a big price (everything has a price), and this price someone will pay. I hope the collapse comes soon, so that the guilty ones get to pay the price, and not our innocent descendants (even though some of them already live among us), and I hope that the Peak Oil-collapse comes way before climate change collapse, so that the climate won't be too much hurt. I hope that the volume of the oil reserves is too highly estimated, so that we can't pump out so much emissions as we would like.

Even if everyone ultimately will be affected by the collapse, it is the poorest ones who notice it first, and are affected by it first. For the poor ones in Greek and Venezuela the collapse is already a reality.



(picture text: A shelf in a shop in Venezuela)

As homeless I believe I will be among the first who notice that the collapse has reached Sweden. The shops will lock up their garbage (which to a great degree already has happened), it will be more and more difficult to find leftovers at the restaurants (this hasn't yet happened), because food will be valued a lot higher when the collapse is a reality to us. The amount of beggars on the streets will be multiplying (which already has happened to a certain degree), and the rich will more and more ensure their assets (which already happens), and everything will therefore be privatized more and more (which already happens for example in the transformation of tenancy rights to co-operative apartments), and the welfare society will be dismantled little by little (which is already underway). A sign of the last-mentioned is that the support for the homeless ones will diminish all the time (which has already happened to some degree in Sweden when the most important place for the homeless ones in Stockholm; "New fellowship" [Ny Gemenskap] was forced to move to the fringe of Stockholm). It is probably the homeless ones who notice the collapse first, because they are the easiest ones to forget when people scramble for the last resources. But justice will be administered finally, because I'm sure the collapse one day will reach the rich ones. The snag is just that the collapse doesn't really "count" as long as it doesn't affect the rich ones. The poor ones namely don't mean very much to the rich, they are just an unpersonal mass of slaves which have to nurture their wealth. We in Sweden maybe don't believe that this is the way we look at the poor in the third world, but in practice, in our actions, this is the view that most of us embody. I hate wealth because of this, because of what it does with a human being, let me be homeless and poor like the roe deers and the elks, let me suffer and die with the poor and homeless, they are my people!

"The longer people maintain a social, economic and ecological system in its growth phase, the sharper, thougher and more destructive its final collapse will be."

(Thomas Homer-Dixon, b. 1956, Canadian political scientist and ecologist)

Colonialism has not been abolished

"We colonize the future. The fossil fuels are a limited storage resource which the grandchildren would need for more important things than highways."

(Alf Hornborg, professor of human ecology at the University of Lund, Sweden)

There is a widespread myth in our society that colonialism is abolished, is a stage that is over. I suggest that this is a dangerous lie that covers up the harsh reality. It was only one form of colonialism that ended in the twentieth century, it has lived on in other forms, in so called "neocolonialism", that multinational corporations colonize the third world. This is a form of economic colonialism, which purport to be uncolonialistic, which purport to "help" the third world, raise their living standard, create jobs for the poor. But behind these fine scenes the oppression and colonialism is smouldering (the poor are not seldom forced to work for the big corporations, when these have destroyed the nature they before made a decent living from as selfsufficient indigenous people). This oppression is often about "unequal exchange" between the poor and the rich part of the world (as Alf Hornborg has pointed out), where the western multinational big businesses make money on the third world and the poor ones selling their work force cheaply, yes often living in slave-like conditions. The big corporations thus make money of the poverty of others! It's terribly disgusting! That's colonialism, if anything is. It reminds me of the cotton industry of the Britons in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, which lived on the cotton plantations of the British colonies, where slaves worked. This way to get rich didn't end, now the slaves are instead working in gigantic factories in India and China, which massproduce cheap products to the rich part of the world. Factories owned by the multinational corporations, which built them there because they couldn't afford domestic workforce (this one couldn't get rich from, because the workers in their own country demanded a worthy compensation and endurable working conditions).

When I see a Swedish book that is printed in the poor Lithuania in the Baltics, then I know what it is about; the exploitation of the poor and the environment for our own profit (like becoming rich and famous oneself). Neocolonialism. But it isn't sustainable in the long run, one can't go on building wealth forever. Somewhere one reaches the limits to the resource growth, both with regard to cheap labour force and to cheap resources. And there comes inexorably a great "Day of reckoning" when one have to begin oneself to pay the price for the growth of the wealth. It happens when Peak Oil, the oil production peak, is crossed, and civilization begins to eat of its own fat. Well, if the slaves don't revolt before that, and throw off the yoke of the neocolonialists, and begin to live as the wild indigenous people, in the wild, freely, without masters, and selfsufficiently (but I don't think this will happen).

Let's hope that the "Day of reckoning" and the Peak Oil comes soon, so that the colonialism can end, so that we acknowledge what a price the poor ones have paid for our wealth, when we ourselves have to begin to pay the bill, not just the third world (the "doomsday" comes, as is known, not until when the rich ones begins to suffer, the suffering of the poor ones doesn't count, their catastrophe is no doomsday). The Peak Oil collapse could be a liberation for the poor ones, so that they could again

live as their wild ancestors, without masters and without slavery. But first the world has to go through an "apocalypse", an unveiling of what wealth leads to (like climate change) (apocalypse is the greek word for unveiling). Maybe there will be established an international tribunal for human rights and an international environmental tribunal, where the big corporations are brought to account for their actions, so that exploitation of the environment and people (who are an aspect of the environment) gets its right price. It becomes a part of the great "Day of reckoning", which the world faces, when humans and corporations have to answer for "ecocide" and neocolonialistic slavery business.

The colonization of nature. And something about humanism, science and zoos.

When one talks about colonialism, one seldom talks about us colonizing nature, even though this is the biggest colonization project of them all – it is simply unimaginably big, we have colonized nature down to the atom level, down to every single nook of the earth. Nothing is any more untouched by the influence of man, not even Himalaya, The Pacific Ocean or the North- and South Pole. We have even colonized the global climate, with terrible consequences, through our emissions. We think we have the right to this colonizing project, because we think nature exists for us, that it has to serve the needs of humans, instead of existing for its own sake, for the sake of its own joy. We think that nature and the animals stand below man, that man is the lord of nature and the animals, and therefore has the right to do with them as he/she likes, exploit them according to his/her own arbitrary decisions. This is terribly disgusting! This is hubris of the strongest sort, and religion carries a great deal of the guilt. But even secular humanism suffers from this, there is a hubris in the ambition of putting man as the measure of all things, in its ambition to elevate man at the expense of other species. Secular humanism certainly was right to stop worshipping and believing in God, but it isn't very much better to worship man, it's just the other side of the coin. There is often a loathsome speciesism (sort of "specie-racism") in humanism, that makes me think we are right in abandoning it. Science suffers from the same hubris as humanism, and is its relative. It is much to blame for the colonizing of nature. I don't advocate that we abandon science for superstition, just that we reform it radically in self-critical direction, so that it is disengaged from the civilized project, which is a project of colonizing nature.

Have you ever tried to go inside a zoo and look at it with unspoiled eyes, with the same look as an extraterrestrial being visiting such a place for the first time? What do you see then? I see the whole civilized project in a nutshell. It's unveiling itself in the zoo. Bottomless hubris and unscrupulous exploitation of poor defenceless animal beings, abysmal colonization of nature, awful slavery business and barbarism, to make money out of the suffering of animals, to sacrifice them on the altar of Mammon. Yes, I don't find enough strong words to express what I think about zoos, so disgusting they are (one can long for the collapse of civilization for lesser reasons). And civilization wants to make the whole earth to one single zoo which shall serve the perverse needs of man. Everything wild shall be tamed, all forests shall become tree plantations which serve man, and the few nature reserves that are left shall also only serve the recreational needs of man, and shall be groomed, "managed"

and guarded as a zoo (not even these are allowed to grow wild). No humans are allowed to find refuge in them and rewild in them (living in cots and small huts), they shall be nature ghettos. This I have experienced on my own skin, when my cot in in the big forest Nackareservatet faced demolition threats by the government during the summer 2007. They wrote in a letter: either you demolish it, or we demolish it. I demolished it myself, and built with the demolished parts a little camouflaged hut on another place in the forest, it remains there to this day, it has been left alone because of the camouflaging (it's covered by peat with grass growing on it) and the cunning location out of the way.

The pupils are bullied by the school teachers

The teacher's treatment of the pupils (here I think primarily of the elementary school) is sometimes a form of bullying, because when they give bad credentials to "untalented"* children, then it's easily interpreted by them as "so much I'm worth as a human". My girlfriend has told that in Japan it has occurred that pupils have committed suicide when they got bad credentials, so pressed they are, because the parents are financing their schooling.

It should be illegal to have tests and give credentials to children. They are not ready for that yet. Tests only plague children and credentials gives the "untalented" bad self-esteem. The whole school should be like it usually is in the first and second classes, when it is still quite humane. Compulsive school attendance should be abolished completely.

It's not just tests which are bullying the children, but also all the punishments which too wild children get for their behaviour. The teachers can't tolerate wildness, according to them children shall be civilized and tamed and enslaved with punishments and threats of punishments. Thus natural, wild children are transformed to obedient, tame cogs in the machinery of civilization, forced to submit to the oppression (1). This is colonialism and bullying. Yes, not only this, but too wild children are also diagnosed as ADHD-children, and are drugged with amphetamine to "calm them down". It's a sin that cries out to heaven. Children are not allowed to be children today (yes, so it has been for a long time). This says something about the civilized project, yes what a contempt for the wild that teachers and parents have. They actually can't tolerate Life itself, can't tolerate too much life. Life shall be killed, be subjected to authority, oppressed and enslaved into the System. The natural, wild children shall be plagued into becoming as oppressive as their teachers, and become a part of the machinery that oppresses nature and the third world. Then the teachers are satisfied – if they have succeeded in this, to get the children to become "normal".

The truth is, however, that the most wild and most "abnormal" children rather often are the healthiest, most alive and unspoiled by civilization, least oppressed, as children naturally should be, full of pranks and play and mischief. It's something sick with the school, with that children have to sit silently by a desk and listen to the monologue of an authoritarian teacher. It's against nature, it's an act of oppression of nature in children. Such things don't exist in the wild nature, only in the sick civilization. Those who talk and fuss on the lesson are the really normal

ones, not those who sit quietly, oppressed. Children should be allowed to play!

When it is the task of the teacher to foster obedient citizens to our half-fascistic society, then oppression is what it's all about.

* We consider children to be "untalented" when they don't fulfil the criteria of the school for being gifted and clever, when they in fact only could have a different ability, one that school can't discover. Instead of being intellectually talented, they could be intuitively, socially or practically talented, maybe talented in areas that the school can't measure, for example in gardening, farming, animal husbandry, house construction, hunting and fishing etc. Maybe they are fantastic at living self-sufficiently, something that is far more important than anything the school teaches. Maybe they are excellent survivalists, who know how one survives when the crisis hits and school is ashamed for not having taught the children survivalism and crisis management. I even believe that "wild", fussy children often can be better at such things than oppressed pupils, because the wild ones stand closer to nature and the earth than the others. But such things are not affirmed in school, which is totally focused on civilizing children and alienating them from nature and the wild, in a colonial spirit. What counts to school is only that one becomes an obedient citizen in our half-fascistic society, not that one becomes independent, self-sufficient, with strong ties to nature and the wild. It's terribly disgusting.

(1) Children should be educated, but to wildness, naturalness, solidarity and freedom, not into an oppressive system, and without degrading punishments. I don't mean that one should allow immorality in children without reacting. But wildness is not immorality.

All cruelty to animals should be criminalized

"If we consciously participate in using our consumer power to support concentration camps for animals, we ultimately kill the animal and the human in ourselves."

(Julian Rose in the book "Changing Course for Life-Local Solutions to Global Problems" 2009)

All cruelty to animals should be criminalized. As it is now, it's often not criminal to plague animals. One is almost allowed to do whatever one wants with animals, they have few rights. To criminalize all cruelty to animals is the first step to a human treatment of animals. The last step is to release all animals, and let them "rewild", where they belong, in a climate and in a nature that suits them. The scientific branch "Conservation biology" should be able to solve the problems that the rewilding process of the animals can cause.

If all cruelty to animals would be criminalized, then all mink- and foxfarms would be immediately forced to close, because these are really cruelty to animals so it cries to heaven! The foxes and the minks are forced to live all their lives in small cages, as big as an opened newspaper, alone and without physical contact with others. Sometimes one can see them running back and forth, restless, so they can have something to

do (animal rights activists have documented such things). It reminds me about how I walked much back and forth in the corridor during my many stays at psychiatric institutions (yes, such things one are forced to do in these places, so boring and inhuman it is there). I therefore know a little how it feels to be a mink or a fox in a fur farm. To maintain such things means a "crime against the animal kingdom" (the equivalent to "crime against humanity" in the animal kingdom), and those who pursue such things should be imprisoned or have to pay big fines.

Humanity is treating the minks as if they had no value in themselves, as if they didn't exist for their own happiness at all, but only to create luxury for humanity. That we are allowed to exploit them at our own discretion.

Likewise it should be an "animal right" that dogs should be allowed to be taken to dog day nursery when the master/mistress goes to work or is away. It should be criminal to let the dog be alone at home 8-10 hours of the day. This is really cruelty to animals! And it's happening on a massive scale all over the world! Shame on you humanity! How should it feel to you to be 8-10 hours as a prisoner alone in an apartment every day?

Zoos should also be criminalized. They are a disgrace for humanity.

Likewise one should let the cows and the horses go out all the year round (certainly with the doors open to the cowhouses, if they want to warm themselves). It is cruelty to animals letting the cows and horses stand in narrow stalls the whole winter, or at all letting them be incarcerated in cowhouses.

And is it necessary to say that animal testing should be criminalized? Cruel animal testings is something of the most disgusting that humanity has brought about, and is the sky-high price that animals have to pay for our health care, among other things. Animal testing is the dark side of healthcare*. And torture occurs inside the animal testing industry. Only in Sweden millions of animals are subjected to animal testing. May this insane crime against the animal kingdom soon stop. Is it strange that one longs for the collapse of civilization when it is doing things like this? Who are able to not long for collapse after having pondered the animal testing industry?

The animal factories with their slaughter are the big genocides of our time. Genocides which are ignored by almost everyone. Animals one can slaughter anyhow, they have no value, it seems like. It causes a great uproar if humans are murdered on a conveyor belt, but the animals, yes their life only exist for us humans, their life has no value in itself.

There is such an astounding imbalance between civilization and the animal kingdom/nature. Systematically the weakest and most defenceless beings among us are used and exploited to enrich the welfare and comfort of man. Everything shall serve humanity. We sacrifice the animals on the altar of Mammon in terrible crimes against the animal kingdom/nature. We thus add up a gigantic debt to the animal kingdom/nature.

* It would cause a great uproar if humans were forced to be tested cruelly for health care purposes. Then we understand how cruel it is. But for some reason we don't react when animals are

tested cruelly, even if they suffer as much as humans. I know why; animals do not have much value to many humans and politicians.

One should never torture a being, however elevated the purpose is. I think the whole animal testing industry should be dismantled, also the testing that is not cruel, because the animals often have to be and live and in small cages, which is torture in itself.

We in the west are bad role models for the third world

Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) was on to something when he married "Lady Poverty". Poverty is namely (besides being fair to others) ecological, and the poor ones in the world have small ecological footprints. It is the rich ones who are the big problem. Wealth is terribly environmentally destructive, not only through the rich ones making big claims on the environment, on resource outtake and slave labour of others, but also through them being bad role models for the third world. They create jealousy in the poor, who idealize the wealth, and want to be rich themselves. This causes a lot of immigration. If we only had been poor, mass immigration would not have been a big problem, but now the immigrants want to be as oppressingly rich as ourselves, thereby hastening the environmental destruction and the waste of resources. What we in the west can do to alleviate this situation, is simply to abdicate from our wealth throne ("love is abdication" the mystic Simone Weil said), and share equally between everyone, so that no one is rich any more, so that we become good role models for the third world, which then also learns to share instead of striving to acquire wealth (and they learn to be satisfied with little). And this happens best through our sharing of our wealth with the immigrants and the third world, foremost through our welcoming all refugees. We have namely a big debt to pay to the poor of the world, who have slaved so much to fatten our wealth.

At the same time as we share equally between everyone in the world (it could be done through a world parliament which distributed basic income to everyone in the world), we have to stop producing wealth, because it doesn't help the environment or the slaves if the economic growth increases, even if everyone have the same amount of products, soil and money. The exploitation just goes on then. The only solution would simply be "degrowth", dismantling the wealth, dismantling civilization, starting with the closing of all unnecessary and harmful industries.

How America forced the children of the indigenous people into boarding schools. How colonialism has continued.

It's informative to study the history of American government's treatment of the indigenous people's children, how they took them away from their parents and forced them into boarding schools, in order to civilize them. Here the essence of the school system is unveiled (the essence of the whole civilization is in fact unveiled here). The indigenous children in the boarding schools were not even allowed to speak their own language at school (they were punished if they did it). The school system wished for the extinction of these children's culture and

language. Their hair was cut (the school imitated the military in many areas, military discipline ruled here), their traditional clothing was exchanged. Their indigenous names were changed to English names. They were forced to change their own religious practices into Christian practices. They were taught that their own culture was inferior to the Christian one. Teachers sneered at and laughed at their traditions, and so on. This is terribly disgusting. One can wish for the collapse of civilization for lesser reasons.

Especially illuminating is the fact that it was often Christian missionaries who did this. The Christians, who thought they were the spiritual and moral elite of the earth, chosen by God! The Christians, who often preached the love of God and the neighbour! It doesn't surprise me that they pursued colonialism, because mainstream-christianity is so rotten that it smells a long way. Can one expect anything else from the oppressive, sadistic god of many Christians?

It is a prevailing view that the colonizing of the indigenous people of America ended. We are somehow not colonialistic any more only because everything wild in human beings is extinguished, all fertile soil is cultivated, almost all indigenous people are civilized, so that there are almost no more wild indigenous people in America left. Few are resisting any longer, few are noticing anything any longer, because we have adapted to colonialism to such a degree that we have become blind to it. So is it at least in Sweden. We have forgotten that we swedes are wild indigenous people under a thin layer of civilized veneer daubed on to us by school and government, and that colonialism continues for every new child who is brainwashed by school to become civilized. We have forgotten that one isn't born civilized, but wild. We think we own our children, that we have the right to subject them to the authority of the state for the rest of their life.

The catastrophe is piling up. Just because we have gotten used to the crimes against humanity and nature, it doesn't mean that they should not be considered as crimes. The teachers are in fact criminals. Who thinks about that? We are fellow criminals if we accept what is happening. We have to speak out and resist colonialism.

What true culture is. The rottenness of humanism

The universities and the humanities have thoroughly failed in educating the public. One isn't truly educated if one can read Horatius and Platon in their original languages. One is truly educated if one's thoughts and one's lifestyle is in harmony with nature, thus with reality. The old religious mystics would call this "the education of the heart". *'Educating the mind without educating the heart is no education at all'*, Aristoteles said.

The Finno-Swedish philosopher Georg Henrik von Wright writes in one of his texts that the old Greeks saw nature as their ideal, which one should pursue: *"As a slogan one could express the Greek view on the relation between nature and man thus: Nature ought to be followed. The task of science, beyond the pure search for truth, is to help man to live "according to nature"*.

“The opposite to the thought, that nature ought to be followed, is the thought that man could rule over nature. The latter thought is alien to Greek view. The Greek’s view on the relationship between nature and man is therefore incompatible with a technology, one could say.”

According to the old Greeks, if one transgressed the limits of nature through hubris, one was hit by nemesis, the revenge of the god nemesis. The “educated” elite of our time has departed breathtakingly far from these ideals, for them nature is often not the ideal, but civilization, man, is. Art instead of reality. Artificiality instead of the natural. There is a vast hubris by the technology believers and civilization-believing humanists of our time. This hubris insists now on a nemesis, and it seems to come now in the form of climate change and Peak Oil.

T.C.Boyle writes in his novel ”A friend of the earth” (from the year 2000) that the one who really want to care about nature becomes the enemy of men. There is something in that, and it says something about how far we have moved away from the ideal of the old Greeks, a ideal which I think is generally shared by wild indigenous people.

Our ”fine” history of literature is amazingly free from ecological thinking and radical critique of civilization. Especially before the seventies with its green wave. There is a few such texts, like pearls scattered here and there, but Thoreau is a little lame, so even Rousseau and Elin Wägner (Leo Tolstoj, Mark Twain and J.R.R.Tolkien are great exceptions, and even in the “Heidi”-books by Johanna Spyri one can find a lot), and by one of our most educated Swedish authors, Vilhelm Ekelund, one finds little inspiration for ecological and civilization critical thinking, too (he functions today more as a status symbol for the elite). I think it is the fault of humanism, humanism has placed a lid on everything radical with its glorifying of man and its speciesism, with its belief in civilization and “culture”, which isn’t any real culture but **artificiality**.

Carbon rationing and David Jonstad’s book ”Our fair share”

I have recently read David Jonstad’s Swedish book “Our fair share. A solution to the climate crisis” (in Swedish: ”Vår beskärda del. En lösning på klimatkrisen”) which was published on Ordfront 2009. I think it’s a very important book, which all politicians should read. It is about “carbon rationing”, which is also called “individual emission rights”. The book starts from the fact that we are in the midst of a very serious climate crisis, and that we therefore need a gigantic mobilization similar to the one Sweden implemented during the Second World War, in order to radically reduce our emissions of carbon dioxide, the villain of the piece. For this to succeed, we need an international, globally implemented carbon rationing, which involves putting an emission ceiling (a carbon budget) on how much the world is allowed to emit of carbon, and then the emissions are distributed between the countries, and between individuals in every country, so that every individual gets just as many emission rations. These are put on an account, and everyone gets a special rationing card, which one pulls in a scanner when one is buying for example gasoline. One can also buy and sell rations, so that people who manage to keep their emissions on a low level, and do not need so many rations, are

rewarded for it through being able to sell them to for example the banks. And people with too high emissions, have to pay for it through being forced to buy rations.

I think this is an equal and fair system, which (at the same time as it fights climate change) would contribute to diminishing the gaps between poor and rich, between first world and third world.

I think also this is an important first step to dismantling civilization.

However, the climate researcher David Wasdell is one of those who suggest that we don’t have any carbon budget to spend, it is “already massively overspent”. I tend to agree. The fact is that it requires the halt of the whole global civilization for us to be able to manage the two degree goal (“*The only way for a 2015 agreement to achieve a 2-degree goal is to shut down the whole global economy*”, the UN climate politician Yvo de Boer said), and even then it can be too late. The world was already 1,5 degrees warmer than preindustrial times during the first half of 2016.

But this is no excuse for refraining from carrying out a carbon rationing system. Such a rationing could give us and other species on the planet more time. I think the climate catastrophe is coming, but we can postpone it through carbon rationing. So that we get more time to prepare, so that the catastrophe doesn’t arrive as a shock, so that it doesn’t trigger chaos, but that we face the end of humanity and civilization with stoical calm, in international solidarity, without war and violence. Yes, maybe we will be able to establish a world parliament which can guide us during the “end times”, and cause that the catastrophe is distributed more equally across the whole planet? There are many reasons for the unification of humanity face to face with its own extinction. International carbon rationing would play a big role in this, so that humanity gets a sacred, worthy demise (I’m thinking here on Carolyn Baker’s fine book, “Sacred demise”)

David Jonstad has also in a radio interview recently expressed that he has become much more pessimistic than he was in his book “Our fair share”. His latter Swedish books, like “Collapse. Life at the end of civilization” (in Swedish: “Kollaps. Livet vid civilisationens slut”, Ordfront 2012) and “Grounded. Simpler life in the shadow of the collapse” (in Swedish: “Jordad. Enklare liv i kollapsens skugga”, Ordfront 2016), bear testimony to this fact. In these books he is pessimist as regard to the prospects for the continuance of civilization (he believed earlier that renewable energy would save us). However, he does not go as far as Guy McPherson, to saying that it’s game over for humanity, but he predicts a collapse of civilization.

My ideal ecovillage. And a possible future scenario.

I have recently been gone on ecovillages. I shall now try to outline how the ecovillage would look like where I would like to live:

It would be a completely ordinary farm far out in the countryside, close to a big forest, with a big dwelling-house, a big cowhouse and a lot of arable land. The dwelling-house

would be the heart of the ecovillage, where the members are gathering during the day to eat and spend time together, especially during winter time, when the dwelling-house is the only heated place in the ecovillage. The dwelling house is heated during winter time with firewood, but some solar panels on the roof assist a little bit.

Most of the people in the ecovillage, which consists of 60 persons, don't live in the dwelling-house, only fifteen persons live there, an extended family with grandfather and grandmother, sons with their wives, and their children (they were the original inhabitants of the ecovillage, those who started it all). A team of 35 persons, which partly consists of small families, live in teepees, cots, yurts and huts on the fields around, every home surrounded by forest gardens, which is cultivated on the fields. Only a small part of the fields are still cultivated as usual, with grains. Every home or cluster of homes has its separate area to administer, and cultivate (the croplands are divided equally between the 35 persons who live here). The teepees and yurts have all stoves, but they are heated up only when it's too cold in the winternights (and in order to have lightning at winter evenings), conserving firewood (if the firewood wouldn't be enough during cold winter nights, they also sleep in the big dwelling house, closely beside each other on the floors). One sleeps in these homes in the night, even in the winter, mostly without heating, one only have thick winter sleeping bags, many layers of blankets and animal furs over oneself. Everything in order to save firewood, because the chainsaws have broken down a long time ago, and there are no new ones to buy, because of the Collapse, so they have to saw with hand saws which the local smith have produced with recycled iron, and this operation was heavy. One also wants to minimize one's carbon emissions, and let the forests become old primeval forests, so that they can bind a lot of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. The few trees that one saws down, are from forest areas which one thins, which grow too densely, and one thus makes sure that one can easily move about freely in the forest. The few trees one saws down are often pretty young, one doesn't manage to saw too thick stems, but the young trees which grow too densely are more than sufficient to heat the main building.

The cowhouse has also been renovated into a dwelling home, but one doesn't heat it (here ten persons live). Everyone gets a seat in the big main building during cold winter days, it almost resembles a mansion, that's how big it is.

The cowhouse has earlier contained sheep in the winter, but one has released them, and they stroll now around the ecovillage, mostly in the forest, and when the winter comes and food is in short supply, one feeds them precisely like people use to do with the roe deers, one puts out food to them in a manger in the periphery of the forest, and they know where to look when food is scarce. They get some oat, wheat, peelings and food leftovers, dried apples and hay that one has cut on a meadow in the summer. Yes, I forgot to say that the ecovillage even cultivates hay on the meadow where the sheep have grazed earlier, in order to have hay to the sheep in the winter. The hay is kept in the loft of the cowhouse.

The forest gardens consist of both fruit trees, nut trees (especially much of these), berry bushes and vegetables on the ground, cultivated as cover crops. They cover such a big area that the whole ecovillage become selfsufficient in fruits, nuts,

berries and vegetables. Even the oat- and wheatfields are sufficient so they don't need to import grain. The ecovillage cuts their grain manually with scythe, mills it manually, the whole process from cropland to bread is made by themselves. The proteins come mostly from the nuts in the nut trees, but the ecovillage also fishes a little in a lake (ten kilometer) nearby, in order to secure that one gets enough proteins. One fishes with nets and fish traps, in small rowboats, because it is considered as more merciful for the fish, who avoids getting a hook in its throat.

When somebody's skinclothes or skinshoes are worn out, one seeks in the forest after dead animals in order to take their skin, and because nobody hunts (hunting of animals was considered as the sin of the Fall, the first sin), the forest have a lot of carcasses. Hunting is forbidden in the ecovillage. One seeks for carcasses only when one's clothes have so much holes in it, that it isn't possible to use or patch up, and the shoes aren't possible to walk in. From the sheep fur one makes woollen yarn, from which one knits clothes, manually. From the animal skin one makes clothes in indigenous manner. Seeking carcasses, knitting, processing animal skin and sawing firewood is the main occupation in the winter, when one doesn't need to administer the gardens. All young people and adults join to help with these three occupations, so that it wouldn't become a too big work burden for any individual (everyone helps also with the gardens in the summer). In average one "works" four hours a day in the summer, and two in the winter. One also has cooking teams, and also takes turns in preparing food.

In the summer one has got so little clothes on the body as possible, in order to preserve one's clothes. If it is hot enough, one walks naked. Nobody are ashamed of this, it is natural for all. Thus they are naturists, the whole bunch. They defend this practice against criticism, with the fact that less clothing means less "work".

In the autumn one is very busy with picking mushrooms and berries in their big forest, and there is also a lot of work with preserving all fruits for the winter. One produces a lot of jam and fruit- and berryjuice, and the leftovers from the production one dries and give to the animals in the forest. But one also dries a lot of fruits and berries, for the needs of the winter, and for the animals in the forest in the winter.

The majority of "work" takes place in the spring and the autumn in the ecovillage. Then one works five hours a day, with plantation and harvest. They have pretty big areas to cultivate, in order to be selfsufficient. The inhabitants of the ecovillage also notice that five hours is the limit after which the body begins to suffer from the work, so they try to place it as an upper limit for how much they work. The farm has no tractor, so everything is made by hand. One only turn over the soil with a spade on the little spot where one cultivates grain. It isn't bigger than twenty times twenty metres, thus four hundred square meter. They also experiment with plows which are drawn by five humans instead of horses and oxes. They have no horse and no ox, not even a tractor. It isn't needed, because one cultivates completely in the spirit of permaculture, with cover crops, without turning over the soil. Only the grain field is tilled over, because grain is difficult to cultivate with cover crops. And then the croplands are mostly filled with fruit trees, nut trees and berry bushes. These foods are the staple food in the ecovillage, instead of grain (as it was in the nineteenth century). The reason

for this is that one doesn't want to have animals in captivity, doesn't want to enslave any horse, doesn't want to force it to work for us, and one doesn't want to be dependent on high technology and fossil fuels, as a tractor would be. All this is possible if one mostly eats fish, fruits, vegetables, berries and nuts, instead of bread. Thus a kind of Stone Age diet. Of everything one eats, one eats fruits most of all. Dried fruit in the winter. The members in the ecovillage have a philosophy that one wants to imitate the apes as much as possible, man is after all a primate. And because the apes mostly eat fruit in the jungle, man should also eat mostly fruit. Fruit is also the food that is easiest to cultivate. Fruit trees doesn't need much work with plantation and harvest. You just have to dig a hole, plant and pick the fruit after a number of years, eat it immediately or make juice of it or dry it. Smart, isn't it? The ceiling and the walls of the dwelling house is full of strings with dried fruit in the winter, because it dries best inside in the warmth. Nursery gardens for berry bushes, fruit and nut trees have become among the most common corporations in the world, because of the "forest garden revival" which swept through the world recently. It was from there the ecovillage bought its fruit tree plants for its forest gardens, but they also raise some plants themselves in their greenhouse (where they also pre-cultivate many of their vegetable plants).

The ecovillage also have an outhouse (no inside toilet, the former toilet inside was needed for other things), where one composts the excrements and the urine, and uses it as fertilizer upon the cultivations. It is the only fertilizer one has, and in this way the loop is closed. When the guys want to pee, they often pee at the fruit trees and the berry bushes in the forest gardens, in order to supply nitrogen to them.

One prepares food with rain water, which is gathered from all the roofs. This is also the water one drinks. One has no electricity except from the solar panels, and it only is enough for a little warming of the dwelling house and for lightning. One has no tap water or shower water, because the pumps have broken down long ago, and one doesn't manage to repair them or buy new ones. One has a little creek a hundred metres from the ecovillage, and in it one washes the clothes in an oldfashioned way, through boiling the clothes in a big cauldron on a bonfire by the creek, and then giving the clothes a rinsing in the creek (one soaks the clothes for several days before one cooks them). No soap is used, to spare wild animals, because fat is needed to make homemade soap. One also washes the body without soap, in the winter through warming water in a cauldron by the creek and mixing it out with cold water in tubs. Because of this everyone is stinking a little, but everyone is so used to each other's bad smells that no one suffers from it. To spare the animals is more important. Everyone helps with the washing of the clothes, both men and women. Most clothes are made of animal skin, but also some of wool. One has no sauna, in order to save firewood.

The ecovillage has a lot of contact with other ecovillages (there are a lot of them. The year is namely 2064). What one needs, but doesn't have, one trades with other ecovillages or buys with the local currency, which reminds a little about Germany's "Minuto"-notes. In the ecovillage one doesn't use any money internally, only for buying products from the outside, which are hardly worth mentioning, stuff like soap. The state has collapsed long time ago, and the cities are empty. Everyone has returned to the countryside in order to cultivate their own food and take

care of themselves. They have heard rumours that this is something that has happened everywhere in the world. Our ecovillage was founded 2032, and thus have a thirty year long history behind. Therefore the forest gardens give already a good harvest, so that they can survive on them, yes even export a little to other ecovillages which have not been able to make that much progress. One trades for example fruit with a little natural soap from an ecovillage thirty kilometers away.

Sometimes many ecovillages gather to conference. One make pilgrimages to these conferences, which reminds a little of the festivals of our time. There experiences are exchanged, there the youth falls in love, there children play together. These are the highlights of the year, and are so many and so near by that anyone can wander or bike there (our ecovillage have many bicycles!)

Our ecovillage have no computers, no mobil phones, no televisions. These have broken down a long time ago, and no new were there to buy. The last functioning computer they had 2060. Internet still exists, but only a few ecovillages have functioning computers, such ecovillages which have technicians and computer geeks who are able to repair computers. Internet is now an exceptional phenomenon, and therefore all the more precious. Those who have computers, sit on important knowledge which they share at the conferences. In this way everyone took part of internet. But everyone anticipates a day when internet would wither away, because the knowledge of how one repairs computers becomes scarcer all the time. One prepares oneself for this day, and fights with all one's power to fix the last computers in the world that functions, which is pretty difficult, because the computers have become so advanced over time. The universities have also been dismantled, so no education in computer technology is available. But in the concerence courses, lectures and workshops are given in computer technology, yes even in all kinds of other things. These conferences are thus very important.

The climate has begun to stabilize now, the climate scientists say, because of the radically reduced emissions, and the many forest gardens and newly planted forests. We have thus avoided the doomsday – the perdition and the extinction of humanity. Now a long era of sustainable development, global peace and justice, remains, for the benefit of one and all. Now the primeval life remains, the return to the primeval time, more and more. Nobody fears this any more, because of the good experiences of the ecovillage movement in this regard.

What was the reason then for leaving the cities and everyone moving to the countryside? Yes, the year 2030 Sweden wasn't allowed to import any more oil from the world market. The amount of global oil export wasn't enough, we weren't enough competitive. This made the Swedish society collapse, and the state was broken up a little like how the Soviet state broke up 1990. The world parliament, which was founded 2025, as a reformed UN, took over, but it didn't interfere with what single individuals did when the environment was not in question (and peace-keeping and fighting poverty), it guarded the environment and put environmental criminals on trial because of new global laws about the rights of nature. During a 34-year period there was built up a gigantic ecovillage movement globally, which astounded the world, yes something that a little resembled how people returned to farming and cultivation after the collapse of Soviet. The renewable energy took over

completely, and the whole world embraced it instead of the fossil fuels, also to avoid further climate change. We were simply forced to do that. But to be able to embrace renewables, we were forced to return to a simple life on the countryside and build ecovillages, all of us. Something else wouldn't work.

How we might help our pets and our livestock to rewild. A possible future scenario in this regard.

I'm a supporter of "rewilding", of both humans and animals (as you likely have noticed here in this book), in the spirit of the anarchoprimitivists. For rewilding of humans I have a quite detailed idea, however not for our pets and our livestock. Here comes some ideas, first for the livestock, then for our dogs and cats:

I take the cows as an example among our livestock. One might begin with letting the cows live outside on the meadow all the winter, if they manage that, while one puts out hay and feed to them. They manage cold better when they can move instead of standing in the stall in the cowhouse, which is the case in many cowhouses, even if it might be warmer in the cowhouse than outside. If the temperature falls to -30 C one can take them inside for a time. But the winters in the future might get warmer, if we just don't lose the Gulf Stream.

When the cows have managed this in say five years, one slowly begins to expand the area they are allowed to move in, to include parts of the forest beside the farm, if there is such one. If there is none, one should make sure that such one emerges, through the planting of forests and forest gardens. One then puts out food to them in the forest in the winter, in a permanent place, using this as long as the cows are in captivity, yes even after that, this so they shall get used to getting their food there, knowing where they shall get food if they can't manage on what forest and meadow provides during the winter. They get then an increasingly bigger part of the forest, which is let's say 20 km² big. Finally they have the whole forest, after still some decades. Now they have also been taught how to eat from forest and meadow even in the winter. And humans have now stopped milking them, one only puts out food to them in the winter in the forest on the permanent place. However, the cows still have (they have had it all the time) free access to the cowhouse, where there is hay and forage. Gradually one puts out less and less feed, because they don't milk, and need to eat less, but also because they get all the time more skilful in finding food in the forest. This phase last so long that one gives the cows a chance to first get used to life in the big forest, with all it has to offer. The cows are also allowed to go with the bulls, and they are allowed to mate freely. This phase can last 20-30 years, and many more generations of cows get used to this life from the birth.

When one have seen that the cows manage this life, one can take the crucial step; to take away the fence from the forest and let the cows go completely free. But one still continues a long time with putting out hay and a little feed, on the permanent place. The risk is now that other animals, like roe deers and deers, steal the food from the cows, but the cows move still, during many decades, almost only on the land where they have been in captivity, and then especially around the feeding place. So I expect that they get most of the hay and feed that is put out.

Finally one recognize that feed is no longer needed, and only put our hay.

For 50-100 years one puts out hay to the rewilded cows in the winter. Gradually they don't come any more to the cowhouse in order to eat, and this is a sign that one looks after in order to know when the time has come when they can manage the food supply themselves. Though, they eat for all time windfalls from the forest gardens, which they have learned to like. This is not hindered, one even puts out some fruits to the cows, one has got so much fruit as time goes by. But one refrains completely from feeding the cows in wintertime first when its time to emigrate south, led by the track that is kept on the population by those who still have functioning computers (a few computer geeks in the world parliament collect these reports). When the population globally have decreased enough, we can emigrate to the warm countries, where the conditions in the winter are considerably much easier, and which are the origins of all of us.

The dogs and cats have rewilded completely in their own ways. They have hanged out with humans in the different ecovillages since the city civilization collapsed. They are free in these ecovillages, and the food one gives them keeps them at our very doors. They are so socialized with humans that the conservation biologists think that they will hang out with humans for an unforeseeably long time, not least the dogs. It doesn't matter, however, the food is enough for them, because humans become all the time deliberately fewer. They are allowed to freely mate, castration was prohibited by the world parliament already 2035.

If there is cattle who simply do not manage the winters in the North without man, they are brought along when one slowly emigrates to South, and are allowed to rewild in the climate where they fit best.

Appendix

A. What is Peak Oil?

"The problem is with those "reserves". Today's reserves are just not the same as those earlier reserves. All the good cheap stuff has already been sucked up. We are now left with dregs at the bottom of the barrel. All today's new oil is harder to find, depletes a whole lot faster, and costs many times as much to produce. None of the cheap stuff is left except in a few old super giant fields that are undergoing infill drilling like there is no tomorrow."

(Ron Patterson)

I have several times here in this book written about Peak Oil, but I have never tried to explain it in a few sentences. Now I shall make an effort to summarize it:

Peak Oil, or the oil production peak, means that one has reached the ceiling in how much one can extract of oil (petroleum) from the oil wells of the world. When one have reached Peak Oil, the production can't be pushed up further, but reaches a plateau, where the extraction is constant, after which it begins to fall after a time, never ever reaching the same levels as during the time of Peak Oil.

The one who first promoted the Peak Oil theory (the concept of Peak Oil was, however, invented first in 2001) was M. King Hubbert (1903-1989) and was a petroleum geologist in USA. He noticed that single oil wells followed a pattern where the extraction rapidly increased, after which it slowed down, and stopped at a plateau, after which it fell, so that the process resembled the form of a bell in a chart. He predicted 1956 the national oil production peak of USA, and was right, it occurred in the beginning of the seventies. He also predicted that the global oil peak would be reached around the year 2000, and was almost right – according to the international energy agency IEA the peak for the conventional oil occurred 2006 (as regard to unconventional oil, like oil sand and shale oil, the oil production is still rising).

What Hubbert didn't expect in his forecasts was that we would invent the extraction of oil from "fracking" (hydraulic fracturing, is also called shale oil *) and tar sands. These two are to blame for the fact that the combined oil production still is increasing considerably (and that we nowadays have an oil glut). But the question is about extremely expensive oil to extract, so for all practical purposes we have reached Peak Oil, the lowest hanging fruits have been picked. The tar sand extraction in Canada is the biggest industrial project in the world, and covers an area of 500 km². It says something about how desperate the oil extraction industry has become, that it stakes so enormously much on so expensive oil extraction (which more resembles mining than ordinary oil extraction), which also is extremely dirty and environmentally destructive. Couldn't they instead increase the production considerably in the Middle East, where most of the oil that is left is? No, it's not possible because they are already pumping maximally over there.

The first clear sign that we have reached Peak Oil, was the financial crisis 2008, which was much caused by the sky-high oil prices, which were six-fold in relation to the prices just in the beginning of the millennium. After that the prices have either been too low for the oil producers or too high for the oil consumers, which was exactly what the scientists thought would happen when we reached Peak Oil.

There has been written a great deal on the internet about Peak Oil, and there has also been published quite a lot of books on the subject, especially in English. Bonniers published this year a Peak Oil-book written by Therese Uddenfelt, which was named "The free lunch. Or why it's so difficult to understand that everything has an end". (Swedish: "Gratislunchen. Eller varför det är så svårt att förstå att allting har ett slut", Bonniers 2016). Thus the Peak Oil-theory is not dead, and it has reached mainstream-attention in Sweden with Uddenfelt's book.

The oil industry has, as a result of fracking and tar sands, succeeded in delaying the oil collapse, delaying the time of Peak Oil, but certain scientists think this will only make the descent at the other side of Peak Oil steeper. I share their view, and I believe that we will face a collapse in society when we have passed Peak Oil and the oil production begins to decline. I just hope there won't be so much oil to extract as the oil industry believes, so we won't be able to harm the climate as much as we want (with our emissions), before the oil collapse comes. I hate the oil industry with all my heart, and I would gladly sabotage it if I could and dared to.

* Fracking is about drilling eight kilometer long horizontal drilling holes, then fracturing the bedrock with a mix of water (50-60 million litres per well) sand (a couple of million kg per well) and a lot of toxic chemicals, being then able to pump up the oil which lies in the pores in the pretty compact bedrock. Very expensive and resource intensive.

B. The climate and the "two degree target"

As you might know, in climate politics there is a common consensus that we have to limit our emissions so that the global warming doesn't rise more than two degrees warmer than preindustrial times, the so called "two degree target", where the idea is that if we limit the warming to two degrees, we avoid catastrophic climate change. This is also the climate politics of IPCC (UN's climate panel). However, what often is forgotten in politics, is that the two degree target is a political target, not a scientific target. For science it has been clear since 1990 that one degree is the real target, not two degrees. This was also acknowledged by UN 1990. For example the most respected climate scientist in the world, James Hansen, has advocated the one degree target. As many might know, we have already passed the one degree target, the world during the first half of the year 2016 was 1,5 degrees warmer than preindustrial times. And it has become more and more clear that the two degree target is utopian. There are those, like the UN climate politician Yvo de Boer, who think we can only cope with the two degree target through shutting down the whole global economy (he said so in 2015). However, I think it has been too late for a long time already, to be able to cope with the two degree target; if the global economy would be shut down completely today, the climate change would nevertheless continue with several degrees of warming, much because of the self-reinforcing feedback loops which we have triggered, like methane gas emissions in the Arctic and the loss of global dimming.

It would suffice with five, six degrees of fast warming for humanity to go extinct. The plants wouldn't manage that. Five degrees is the difference between the average temperature of the last ice age and the average temperature today.

"Some scientists are indicating we should make plans to adapt to a 4C world. While prudent, one wonders what portion of the living population now could adapt to such a world, and my view is that it's just a few thousand people [seeking refuge] in the Arctic or Antarctica."

(Ira Leifer, atmospheric and marine scientist, at University of California, Santa Barbara)

C. The rule of "The Holy Order of Nature"

During the summer 2005, when I still studied theology at Åbo Akademi University (in Turku, Finland), I founded a monk order for myself, "The Holy Order of Nature". Over the years I have needed to upgrade the order rule, and I do it again:

The Holy Order of Nature

Founded: During the summer 2005, in one of the forests in Varissuo, Turku, when Lars Larsen married a tree, the pine Shekina.

Aim: Our aim is to work for the healing of Mother Earth. “An ecologically sustainable humanity” is our motto.

Main principle: The loyalty to Mother Earth. Mother Earth is our god and our only homeland to whom we give our all. We don't accept any country as our homeland. We are radical-pacifistic anarchoprimitivists. We simply want to undermine the state and civilization in a peaceful manner, with civil disobedience and passive resistance. We see ourselves engaged in an invisible war, where civilization makes war against nature, and we choose to stand at the side of nature in this war.

Members: This is no cult, we have no actual members. The order is a playful, poetic framework around the work of Lars Larsen. But inofficially, playfully, we have three members: Lars Larsen, Titti Spaltro and “Forest-David”. All animals are natural, selfevident members of our order, because they all live in the by our order demanded poverty and loyalty to Mother Earth.

Monastery: Nature is our only monastery. We live in the forests. In small cabins, huts, caves, cots and tents. Nature is our castle, our last sanctuary, and we are fighting for the last forests and wildernesses being kept intact and wild. We do this better when we live in the wild nature.

Abbeys/Abbesses: Our leaders are the non-human animals, the wild and the tame, the mosquito and the spider as well as the fox and the bear. The animals have a tendency to live in harmony with Mother Earth that we highly appreciate. It's about time that the animals are listened to in politics, that they get their voice heard. Far too long we have rushed along as if the animals didn't exist. All animals want the wild, free life in the forests, which they are created for, and surely they want the dismantling of civilization. We listen to their prayers with our mystical, inner ears.

Human role models: Francis of Assisi is our greatest human example. Our order appreciate his Franciscan Order, as it was in the beginning, on the time of Francis, but without the catholic fundamentalism that characterized him. Other mythical and non-mythical role models are Jesus, Robin Hood, Tarzan, Mowgli, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Henry David Thoreau and Andris Fågelviskare Hansen.

Order rules: We give the three traditional monastery vows: Poverty, chastity and obedience.

1) *Poverty:* We imitate the poverty ideal of Saint Francis. Because we try to live in small huts, cots, caves and tents in the forests, we cannot own more than we can carry with us. We want to have loose ties to civilization. We prefer to not work for salary, because we see ordinary money as something evil, and we do not want this evil to spread. To pay for some service is often to claim that someone shall slave for us, and we want to liberate everyone to a selfsufficient and ecologically sustainable life. We resist the modern wage bondage. We work instead as volunteers, without salary. At least mostly. And if we would get

a bigger sum of money, they belong to the homeless and the beggars in our big cities, and organizations like Föreningen Naturliv (The association of Nature Life), Greenpeace and the Transition movement. One thing we give priority to, is to pay for the spreading of information that can partake in “saving the world” through various printed matters, printed preferably on recycled paper. We also use bigger sums of money to invest in nature and primitive lifestyle, invest in really important things which are part of saving the world, instead of investing in the stock market and other such things, which will vanish.

2) *Chastity:* We do not sell our free life in the forest in order to get a woman/man. We are faithful to nature and to the life in the forest even if we would find ourselves a partner. We do not prohibit this, but if we would find somebody to live with, it has to be under “living apart-conditions”, if the man/woman do not move out to the forest, too. We refrain from having children, because of the overpopulation problem (most people in our civilization should refrain from having children).

3) *Obedience:* We obey our abbeyes and abbesses, the animals, and nobody else. We receive their silent commands through the inner, mystical way. We know from looking an orangutang in the eyes, what it wants. It wants freedom for all, the dismantling of civilization, the return of the croplands to become forests, the radical shrinking of the amount of humans and the comeback of the wild life.

Sacrament: We have only one sacrament. It is walking barefoot, as often as we can, from the thawing of the frost in the spring, until the frost arrives in the autumn, yes even in winter when it's not too cold. Barefoot-walking is our holy communion with our god, Mother Earth. It gives us contact with the earth, contact with our god. It grounds us in our god. Walking barefoot is our most important link back to our animal origins, when we walked barefoot in the jungle. As naturists, we have as little clothes as we can and as little as we are allowed to have in our civilization, heralding an utopian future when we don't need to be ashamed of our nakedness.

This order rule is updated 28.11.2017